270
M866h
vol. 5

BX945 .M6813 1930
v.5
Mourret, Fernand, 1854-1938.
A history of the Catholic
church

DOMINICAN COLLEGE
LIBRARY
SAN RAFAEL

A HISTORY OF THE CATHOLIC CHURCH

DOMINICAN COLLEGE
LIBRARY
SAN RAFAEL

BY

THE REV. FERNAND MOURRET, S.S.

TRANSLATED BY

THE REV. NEWTON THOMPSON, S.T.D.

VOLUME FIVE

PERIOD OF THE RENAISSANCE AND REFORMATION

B. HERDER BOOK CO.,
15 & 17 SOUTH BROADWAY, ST. LOUIS, MO.,
AND
33 QUEEN SQUARE, LONDON, W. C.
1930

270
M866h
vol. 5

ALL RIGHTS RESERVED
Printed in U. S. A.

NIHIL OBSTAT

Sti. Ludovici, die 4. Aug., 1930,
Joannes Rothensteiner,
Censor Librorum

31-507

IMPRIMATUR

Sti. Ludovici, die 5. Aug., 1930,
✠ *Joannes J. Glennon,*
Archiepiscopus

Copyright 1930
BY B. HERDER BOOK CO.

Vail-Ballou Press, Inc., Binghamton and New York

25081

TRANSLATOR'S PREFACE

To the Preface of the author, as rendered below, the translator wishes to add that in this English edition of Mourret the fifth volume appears first, because it is the best one by which to introduce the work to the English-speaking public; the other nine will follow in due course. Those who are competent to judge agree that Mourret's *Histoire de l'Eglise* is unsurpassed as a comprehensive, detailed, and reliable setting forth of the history of the Church. The whole work, when supplied with an adequate index, will be the equivalent of an exhaustive thesaurus of Church History, such as is needed particularly at the present time, when we are entering upon a new era of apologetics, with radio lectures, question boxes, apologetic sermons and lectures, etc.

The bibliography of works which are referred to in the course of the volume, appears as an appendix. It is not in the French original, but we believe it will be welcomed by the student.

THE TRANSLATOR

AUTHOR'S PREFACE

The religious and social revolt that broke out in the sixteenth century can be fully explained only by a study of the religious, social, and political disturbances of the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries. The Western Schism shook the authority of the popes; the worldly life of certain pontiffs and prelates of their court increased their discredit; the ill-will and sometimes the violent opposition of rulers, inspired by the legists, thwarted the action of the Church; the intoxication of learning and a passion for art and letters developed a spirit of risky independence in the minds of men; the decadence of Scholasticism favored the growth of a dubious mysticism; the sudden development of industry and commerce, the rapid formation of absolute monarchies, and the abrupt appearance of the new power of capitalism, by wiping out the liberties and rights of the old medieval organization, complicated the religious crisis by a social and political crisis, while threatening to extend the slightest shock into a catastrophe of unforeseen proportions. A general uneasiness was in the air. On all sides there was talk of the need of reform. Ever since a certain eminent bishop at the Council of Vienna, in 1311, had called for a reform *in capite et membris,* in the head of the Church and in its members, the formula became popular and was frequently repeated by church councils. While prudent men considered the ways and means of accomplishing the reform through prayer and good works in the Church and by the Church, impassioned and turbulent minds undertook to bring it about by violence and revolt, outside the Church and against it. Luther in Germany, Henry VIII in England, Calvin in

France, and Zwingli in Switzerland assumed the leadership in this movement.

The watchwords of these four so-called reformers were: to purify the Church of scandals, to liberate rulers and Christian peoples from the "tyranny" of Rome, to free consciences from the oppression of doctrinal formulas and the dominance of the Catholic hierarchy, and to lead Christianity back to its pristine purity.

How these men did but aggravate the evils for which they claimed to bring relief; how from Luther's work there issued disorder and corruption of morals in Germany, from Henry VIII's work the enslavement of the Church in England, from Calvin's work the most despairing of doctrines and the most inquisitorial of governments, from Zwingli's work the most dissolvent of systems; how all these noisy appeals for reform succeeded in covering Europe with blood, upsetting consciences, and preparing the way for the worst social and religious catastrophes: to point this out through a recital of the facts of history is the aim of this volume.

Herein we shall also see in what manner the Catholic Church, under the guidance of her legitimate hierarchy, brought about the needed reform and regenerated herself by her own means. Of these the chief was the meeting of the Ecumenical Council of Trent. But the founding of various religious Orders, especially the celebrated Society of Jesus, and the growth of their activities in the realms of science and the apostolate, the reform of the clergy under the energetic influence of St. Charles Borromeo, the firm and lofty policy of St. Pius V, the new impulse given to piety under the influence of St. Teresa, and an unprecedented development of distant missionary enterprises—all these factors helped to prepare for the great Council and continued its work.

An impartial study of the facts will also reveal the fundamental impotence of the so-called reformers and the exhaust-less vitality of the Catholic Church. It will likewise show us how vain were the pretexts appealed to in justification of the revolt. To attribute the religious crisis of the sixteenth century to abuses of "papal tyranny" and the "corruption of the clergy" is unjust. As we shall see, papal authority never weighed more lightly on States and individuals. Moreover, the very countries where the influence of Rome was the most active—Italy, Spain, and France—were the ones that remained loyal to the Church, whereas it was England, Northern Germany, and Scandinavia that broke away.

As for the corruption of the clergy, five centuries earlier Pope St. Gregory VII cured abuses no less flagrant and accomplished reforms no less difficult. The real causes of the Protestant revolt are to be found elsewhere. Social disturbances, which were brought on by the advent of great States and the break-up of medieval Christendom, deep-rooted hostility to Rome that can be traced back to the strifes between the priesthood and the Empire, a sectarian spirit attaching to the Hussites and the Vaudois, the pride and passions of men who put themselves at the head of the "reform movement"—such were the determining causes of the religious revolt which the sixteenth century witnessed and which had its chief fields of action in Germany, England, and France.

Might we not, at least, justly blame the incapacity or indolence of the papacy for the proportions which the revolt assumed and for the calamities that ensued? It must be admitted that Alexander VI's family interests, the political designs of Julius II, and the too exclusive cultivation of arts and letters that filled the pontificate of Leo X diverted the popes from the great effort required by the religious welfare of the Christian world and at least prevented their perceiving the magnitude of the danger that threatened the Church. But weightier responsibility fell upon those rulers who were false to their duty as defenders of the Church, upon those episcopal bodies that were infected with the Gallican spirit, and upon those parliaments which, in ceaseless conflict with the Roman court, placed obstacles in the way of a full effectiveness of papal effort, and even affected the common people, who throughout the Middle Ages, by a more active participation in public life and by a freer and more spontaneous piety, had been a support to the reform labors of the popes. But this Christian people came to lose nearly all social action, was caught in the net of a more and more centralized administration, and was unconsciously infected with the poison of skepticism and sensuality by the works of art of the Renaissance; it no longer constituted, about the head of the Church, that atmosphere of respectful and sympathetic confidence to facilitate and powerfully second his endeavors. In all catastrophes, as in all regenerative undertakings, responsibility reaches farther and mounts higher than appears at first glance.

In concluding the preface to his *History of the Variations of the Protestant Churches,* Bossuet expresses the hope that "this work, which at first might seem contentious, will tend to promote peace more than strife," that his Protestant readers will better understand how the variations and lessening of doctrine have their root in the initial movement giving birth to heresy, and that his Catholic readers "will be filled with a humble and holy awe by considering the delicate and perilous temptations which God at times permits His Church to encounter and the punishment He sometimes inflicts on her. Hence we should constantly pray that she may have exemplary and enlightened pastors, since it was the lack of enough such that led to the ravaging of the flock which was redeemed at so great a price."

This is the good that we dare to hope for, with God's help, as the fruit of the present work.

THE AUTHOR

* * * * * * * *

CONTENTS

PART I

THE RENAISSANCE

CHAPTER PAGE

I. THE DECLINE OF MEDIEVAL INSTITUTIONS 3

II. THE LEGISTS 9
  Philip the Fair's National Policy 13
  Boniface VIII 19
  The Bull *"Clericis laicos"* 25
  The Question of Papal Supremacy 30
  The Anagni Outrage 39
  Benedict XI 42

III. 1305–1315 48
  Clement V 49
  Attempted Condemnation of Boniface VIII 51
  The Knights Templars 56
  The Council of Vienne 64
  The Empire in Italy 68
  Heresies 71

IV. 1316–1378 78
  John XXII 78
  The "Spiritual Brethren" 80
  Marsilius of Padua and John of Janduno 82
  The Annates 89
  Benedict XII 92
  Clement VI 95
  Innocent VI 99
  Urban V 103
  Gregory XI 106

V. 1378–1417 114
  Urban VI 114
  Beginning of the Schism 119
  Benedict XIII of Avignon 124
  The Saints and the Schism 131
  The Council of Pisa 136

CHAPTER PAGE
Alexander V . . . 138
John XXIII . . . 139
The Council of Constance . . . 141
John Hus . . . 147
The End of the Schism . . . 149

VI. 1417–1447 . . . 152
Martin V . . . 153
Eugene IV . . . 159
The Union of the Churches . . . 166
The Pragmatic Sanction of Bourges . . . 172
Joan of Arc . . . 175

VII. 1447–1492 . . . 179
Nicholas V . . . 180
Callistus III . . . 185
Pius II . . . 189
Paul II . . . 195
Sixtus IV . . . 197
Monks and Friars . . . 202
Innocent VIII . . . 208
Savonarola . . . 211

VIII. ALEXANDER VI . . . 214
His Nepotism . . . 216
King Charles VIII of France . . . 218
Murder of the Duke of Gandia . . . 221
Savonarola . . . 225
Caesar Borgia . . . 233
Alexander VI and the New World . . . 235
Death of Alexander VI . . . 237

IX. 1503–1517 . . . 239
Pius III . . . 239
Julius II . . . 241
Real Power of the Papacy . . . 245
The Lateran Council . . . 248
Leo X . . . 252
The Concordat with France . . . 255

X. THE INTELLECTUAL EVOLUTION OF THE RENAISSANCE . 261
Petrarch . . . 261
After the Western Schism . . . 264

CHAPTER PAGE
Greek Literary Culture at Florence 269
Architecture and Painting 274
Influence of Savonarola 277
Philosophy and Theology 281
Mysticism 287

PART II

THE PROTESTANT REVOLT

I. The Prelude in Germany 299
Characteristics of the German Renaissance 299
Luther the Student 305
Luther as a Monk 313
II. Luther's Revolt 325
The Decree of Indulgences 325
Luther's Theses 328
The Humanists 330
Papal Intervention 335
Luther and Miltitz 342
The Theologians 345
III. The Spread of Lutheranism in Germany 350
Alliance of Revolutionary Parties in Germany . . . 350
Luther Excommunicated 352
Emperor Charles V 356
The Diet of Worms 357
Luther at Wartburg 362
The Height of Luther's Success 367
Lack of Union Among Luther's Followers 371
The Sacramentary Dispute 373
Luther's Marriage 376
The Diet of Augsburg 377
The Smalkaldic League 380
The Anabaptists 381
No Reunion with Rome 382
Dogmatic Syncretism and Individualistic Pietism . . 386
IV. Protestantism in England 390
Precursors 390
Henry VIII, Defender of the Faith 392

CHAPTER PAGE
Divorce of Henry VIII 394
The King Proclaimed Supreme Head of the Church . . 400
The Schism Accomplished 402
Fisher and More 407
Executions and Confiscations 411

V. PROTESTANTISM IN ENGLAND 416
Edward VI 416
Doctrinal and Disciplinary Measures 416

VI. PROTESTANTISM IN ENGLAND 423
Queen Mary's Policy of Conciliation 423
Bloody Repressions 424
Queen Elizabeth 429
Elizabeth's Persecution of the Church 432
The Puritans 435

VII. PROTESTANTISM IN FRANCE 438
The Precursors 438
The Classes in French Society 439
Lefèvre d'Etaples 444
The "Cenacle of Meaux" 445
Attitude of Francis I 450
Massacre of the Vaudois 455

VIII. THE BEGINNINGS OF CALVINISM 459
John Calvin 459
Calvin's Teaching 463
Calvinism at Geneva 467

IX. PROTESTANTISM IN FRANCE 472
Henry II Against the Huguenots 472
France Under the Rule of Factions 477
St. Bartholomew's Day 484
The League 490
Henry of Navarre 493
The Edict of Nantes 498

X. PROTESTANTISM IN THE COUNTRIES OF THE NORTH . . . 501
The Netherlands 501
The Scandinavian Countries 507
Other Countries 511

PART III

THE CATHOLIC REFORMATION

CHAPTER PAGE

I. THE CATHOLIC REFORMATION AND THE POPES OF THE SIXTEENTH CENTURY . . . 517
Adrian VI . . . 518
Clement VII . . . 520
Paul III . . . 522
Julius III . . . 524
Marcellus II . . . 525
Paul IV . . . 525
Pius IV . . . 528
St. Pius V . . . 530
Gregory XIII . . . 534
Sixtus V . . . 537
Urban VII, Gregory XIV, Innocent IX, Clement VIII . 540

II. THE CATHOLIC REFORMATION AND THE COUNCIL OF TRENT 542
Difficulties in the Way of Convocation . . . 542
Opening of the Council . . . 545
The Bible and the Rule of Faith . . . 548
Original Sin . . . 550
Justification . . . 552
The Sessions Interrupted . . . 556
The Eucharist, Penance, and Extreme Unction . . . 557
A Ten Years' Interruption . . . 560
The Mass, Holy Orders, Matrimony . . . 563
Disciplinary Questions . . . 564

III. THE CATHOLIC REFORMATION AND CATHOLIC RULERS . . 573
Situation of the Church . . . 573
Favorable Attitude of Catholic Rulers . . . 576
The Inquisition . . . 577
The Index of Forbidden Books . . . 581

IV. THE CATHOLIC REFORMATION AND THE SECULAR CLERGY . 583
St. Charles Borromeo . . . 583
St. Charles and the Institution of Seminaries . . . 586
Pope St. Pius V . . . 591

V. THE CATHOLIC REFORMATION AND THE REGULAR CLERGY . 594
The Carmelites . . . 597

CHAPTER PAGE
St. Teresa 599
New Religious Orders 603
Religious Orders in Italy 607

VI. The Jesuits 612
St. Ignatius of Loyola 613
The Jesuit Form of Government 616
Expansion of Jesuit Activities 620

VII. The Catholic Reformation in the Intellectual World 626

VIII. The Catholic Reformation and the Spiritual Life . 639
The "Spiritual Exercises" 639
The Mysticism of St. Teresa 642

Bibliography 649

A HISTORY OF THE CATHOLIC CHURCH

VOLUME V

I. THE RENAISSANCE
II. THE PROTESTANT REVOLT
III. THE CATHOLIC REFORMATION

PART I

THE RENAISSANCE

CHAPTER I

The Decline of Medieval Institutions

THE thirteenth century marked the apogee of Christian life and influence. A vast federation of Christian nations, grouped together under the supreme authority of the pope, the spiritual head of all the faithful and acknowledged arbiter of kings and peoples; a closely knit hierarchy of rights and duties, based on land tenure and crowned by the supremacy of the emperor, who was the born defender of the Church: such was the ideal which the popes of the Middle Ages, from St. Nicholas I to Innocent III, had conceived, striven for, and attained so far as possible, and which Boniface VIII set out to defend with the utmost energy. At the summit of this mighty political organization was the pope. To him, as spiritual head, it belonged to denounce heresies, to arm the civil power for their repression, to judge the political acts of temporal rulers *ratione peccati,* to summon and set in motion all the armies of Christendom and hurl them against the infidel. As the head of human society, invested with an unquestioned moral authority, he passed sovereign judgment in the conflicts that arose between States and, within each Christian nation, between the different classes of society, notably between rulers and their subjects.

It would be unjust to blame the attacks by certain men, however powerful, as solely responsible for the events which shook the mighty social edifice of Christendom. Its decadence goes back to deeper and more general causes. The formation of the great European States, the development of royal absolutism, and the advent of a great moneyed bourgeoisie had silently undermined the structure and disturbed its regular functioning. The Western Schism, by making it almost impossible to discover who was pope, led the people to turn to their immediate rulers—bishops, priests, and temporal princes. "My master's power is real," said Pierre Flote, one of Philip the Fair's legists, addressing Pope Boniface VIII at the beginning of the fourteenth century, "yours is only verbal." [1] Legist theories, attacks of heterodox teachers, and plots of popular agitators would have been less effective and perhaps would not have occurred at all had they not been provoked by the appearance of those new political and social forces around which special interests and ambitions grouped themselves.

In Germany wars and conflicts, stirred up by the emperors against the Church, had weakened the moral bond that made the unity of the empire. The waste of landed revenues under Frederick II and the partition of the royal prerogatives among the States favored the powers of the princes, who "aimed only at acquiring domains over which they would be sole masters." [2] The efforts of Rudolph of Hapsburg and his son Albert to reëstablish the empire's unity by relying on the strength of the bourgeoisie only increased the latter's power. From this epoch we may date the privileges and great development of free cities, a new social element which, stimulated by an extraordinary growth of industry and commerce, increased outside the feudal system and in opposition to it.[3] The prosperity of the big cities and their subsequent political independence led Machiavelli to call them "the real nerve of the empire." [4]

---

[1] Dupuy, *Histoire du différend entre Boniface VIII et Philippe le Bel.*

[2] Janssen, *L'Allemagne et la Réforme,* I, p. 417.

[3] *Ibid.,* I, p. 425.

In Italy the conflicts of the twelfth and thirteenth centuries brought about the formation of powerful leagues between the chief cities. Florence, the city of noise and movement, and Venice, the city of silent immobility and mysterious politics, were destined for a long time to keep their power and social preëminence. But all around them petty local tyrannies, which the weakness of the empire had allowed to become established, stifled civil liberties and outraged Christian faith. Ferrante of Naples, whose delight it was to imprison his foes in strongly built cages and, after their death, to make a collection of their mummies; [5] Giovanni Maria Visconti of Milan, who trained his dogs to hunt men; [6] Agnello of Pisa, who required those serving him to kneel: [7] these and other such men of the time were inspired more by recollections of the pagan Roman Empire than by Christian traditions of the Middle Ages.[8]

In England, while large cities, such as London, York, Norwich, Bristol, and Coventry, grew wealthy and rose in importance through industry and commerce,[9] the kings engaged in more conflicts with the Church of Rome than was the case anywhere else.[10] The War of the Roses, by ruining the upper nobility, and the appearance of various sects, like the Lollards, by breaking the unity of the faith, put an end to the Middle Ages in England.

Monarchical absolutism in France, before formulating its maxims and finding a theory for its justification in the Roman law, was already a matter of history. The need of order and unity and the necessity of defense against foreign invasions had little by little rallied the social forces about the king, as religious perplexities during the Western Schism gathered the faithful about their bishops. The agricultural, industrial, and commercial renaissance, favored by political unity, drew a considerable immigration to France[11] and produced an era of unexampled ease and prosperity.[12] The feudal nobility lost its prestige. It was the period when the ponderous, massive old castle, formidably equipped for defense, was abandoned or altered into a new abode with open balconies, large windows with carved tracery and well-lighted galleries. Often the new mansion became the dwelling of a wealthy merchant or a magistrate titled for his devotion to the royal power. This new nobility, instead of bridging the gaps that divided the classes, only made them wider.[13] The parvenus did not fuse well with the old aristocracy and separated themselves with the more disdain from the common people.

---

[4] *The Writings of Niccolo Machiavelli,* IV, p. 387.

[5] Jovius, *Historiarum sui temporis libri XLV,* I, p. 14.

[6] Corio, *Storia di Milano,* p. 301.

[7] Filippo Villani, *Storie,* XI, p. 101.

[8] Cf. Burkhardt, *The Civilization of the Period of the Renaissance in Italy,* I, chaps. 1–6, pp. 4–75.

[9] Bémont, in Lavisse and Rambaud, *Histoire générale,* III, p. 109.

[10] Trésal, *Les origines du schisme anglican,* p. 4.

Among the latter a revolutionary spirit was being fermented by two causes: a rapid trend toward civil and political liberty and the simultaneous increase of poverty and wretchedness.

The trend towards liberty was hastened in the second half of the fifteenth century by various influences, some of a religious or humanitarian, others of an economic or a political order. The kings and nobles had a political and economic interest in liberating the serfs, who, once they were free, began to repopulate the deserted villages and to renew the tillage of the soil by laboring more assiduously and effectively because it was more to their advantage. In the early years of the fourteenth century, serfdom, according to Imbart de la Tour, "appears to be more and more an exception." [14]

---

[11] Imbart de la Tour, *Les origines de la Réforme,* I, pp. 287–295.

[12] *Ibid.,* p. 302.

[13] *Ibid.,* p. 460.

The freed serfs at once began to organize politically. Rural communities elected their own councillors, procurators, and syndics. In the States General of 1484 [15] we find the villages represented for the first time.

Unfortunately this rapid progress towards liberty was favored only in the rural classes. It was hindered among city workers and coincided with the spread of poverty. Despite the development of agriculture and commerce which marked this period, prime necessaries of life, such as wheat, wine, cloth, and wood, became dearer. The rise of prices was due to a badly organized fiscal system and especially to incessant wars.

But wages remained stationary. "In 1500 a workman's wage was certainly too low to support him and his family; after 1515 it drove him to beg or borrow." [16]

The Church by means of confraternities and the State by means of subventions and various other devices tried to ward off the evil. But these means were insufficient. Medieval institutions were in ruin and those of the modern world still in course of formation.

But from these two facts, pauperism and the trend toward political liberty, there fatally resulted a revolutionary spirit. "In each town there is propagated a center of agitation and disorder. Imagine a little spark in that explosive mass: an election, a new tax, a threat of dearth; the town is inflamed. It is easy to foresee what the religious conflicts will be under such circumstances. . . . Beneath the splendor of the Renaissance, the glitter of victories and celebrations, the flashing display of wealth . . . if you but lend an ear you may hear the wretches' murmur which will change into a wild clamor on the day when the clash of beliefs arms all these appetites and absorbs all these attempts." [17]

---

[14] *Ibid.*, p. 468.

[15] *Ibid.*, p. 491. To the States General of 1302, Philip the Fair had invited representatives of the "common people"; but the rural communities did not form a legal unit in public institutions until 1484.

[16] *Ibid.*, p. 512.

It has been said that the Protestant Reformation was made in England by kings, in Germany by nobles, and in France by the people. This statement is too systematic to be exact.[18] Yet it is true that the people of France were only too well prepared to give ready ear to every whisper of revolt or revolution.

---

[17] *Ibid.*

[18] Cf. Hauser, *La Réforme et les classes populaires en France au XVI^e siècle,* in the *Revue d'Histoire Moderne et Contemporaine,* 1899–1900, and Hanotaux, *Histoire du Cardinal de Richelieu,* I, pp. 473–475.

CHAPTER II

1294–1304

The Legists

So long as a social movement has not found a formula for its expression and a guide for its orientation, it is little to be feared. The movement that attacked the political and social institutions of the Middle Ages found its first expression and orientation in the work of the legists.

Legists, or *chevaliers ès-lois,* was the name given to those men who, from the thirteenth century on, professionally devoted themselves to the study of Roman law and became the kings' councillors.[1] St. Louis, in his desire to reform legislation and improve it, summoned them to his aid, but he did not suffer himself to be dominated by them. Their influence became preponderant under the last descendants of the direct line of the Capetians.

The traditional account according to which the study of Roman law goes back to the discovery of the "Pandects" by the Pisans during the pillage of Amalfi in 1133 is a pure legend.[2] But the legists' opposition, violent at times, to the feudal law and to the Church, which was the soul of that law, derived its formulas and principles from the Roman law, which celebrated professors were teaching with great brilliancy at Bologna, Montpellier, Toulouse, Lyons, and many other cities. Enthusiastic youth flocked to the classes of the law professors as had been the case with the grammarians of Charlemagne's time and the philosophers in the days of Abélard and as, two centuries later, they gathered about the humanist teachers.

---

[1] Caillemer, *L'enseignement du droit civil en France vers la fin du XIII^e^ siècle,* in the *Nouvelle Revue Historique du Droit Français et Étranger,* 1879, pp. 606 sqq.; Thierry, *The Formation and Progress of the Tiers Etat, or Third Estate, in France,* I, pp. 50 sqq.

[2] Savigny and Schrader long ago proved the unlikelihood of this legend, which first made its appearance two centuries after the supposed event, in an obscure poem by the Dominican Raynier de Gronchi (Muratori, *Rerum italicarum scriptores,* XII, pp. 287, 314). Rivier, professor of Pandects at the Brussels University, has indisputably established the unbroken continuity of the study of Roman law in Italy throughout the early Middle Ages. *Revue Historique du Droit Français,* 1877, pp. 1 sqq.

The four principal foundations on which medieval society was built were custom, land tenure, feudal contract, and Christian royalty. All these had undergone crises calling for reform and readjustment. With an abstract logic which might fittingly be compared to that of the theorists of the French Revolution, and often with a violence not unlike the Jacobin fury of the men of 1793, the legists set to work to destroy what had need rather of being restored and to transform the incipient evolution into a veritable revolution.

The many different elements forming society in the thirteenth century—fiefs, manors, baronies, shires, towns with charters of freedom, cities with elective governments, workmen's and merchants' corporations, communities of peasants, parishes, universities—all these had come into being by the force of things and were directed by the circumstances of the time under the impulse and sometimes the restraint of the Christian spirit, like the vegetation of an immense virgin forest. Each institution had its own special character, its rules, its spirit, its interests, at times its own distinctive dress. The value of such organization was in its very diversity, flexibility, adaptation to each locality and period, and its unlimited capacity of transformation by custom which, having created it, could alter it indefinitely. The trouble with the system sprang from this same diversity, which had become well-nigh inextricable, and from its elusive and ever shifting legal procedure. This common law was odious to the legists, who admired the exactness, logic, and clearness of the written law of ancient Rome. One of these fourteenth century legists said: "That is a hateful law which, because of the custom of the country, is contrary to the written law." [3]

In the hierarchy of social institutions, the Middle Ages had never divorced the idea of sovereignty from that of landed property. Jurisdiction was acquired with the land, and prerogatives were lost with the alienation of property. Land was suzerain and vassal. The diverse rights attached to the land always corresponded to obligations and duties. But the jurist, in opposition to this notion which he considered barbarous, set forth the idea of the old Roman law, which looked upon the right of property as an absolute right to use, enjoy, and dispose of (*jus utendi, fruendi, et abutendi*), without any obligation to a superior or any duty towards an inferior.

The medieval social groups formed a hierarchical organization, in which the relations and activities were regulated by contracts whereof the details that remained undetermined by custom were specified by precise, positive agreements. "In every part of the country," says Imbart de la Tour, "solemn agreements fixed the amount of rents and taxes, the length of ordinary armed service and knightly service, . . . the gradation of private and public rights. Throughout the whole kingdom there was established the right to discuss, through representatives, any change in these pacts, any increase in taxation, or any modification of the law, and to determine obligations or services." [4] Against such a state of things the legist protested; in his eyes the law should be uniform, every local exemption being objectionable and every concession of liberties being subject to revocation by the king, who was the dispenser of all civil and political rights.[5]

---

[3] Boutillier, *Somme rurale,* bk. I, tit. 1.

[4] Imbart de la Tour, I, p. 22.

[5] *Ibid.,* p. 37.

In the Middle Ages "the most Christian king" was by his coronation oath charged with "safeguarding all rights . . . and repressing all injustices";[6] and for the proper exercise of this duty he was responsible before God, from whom he held his power. The legists also proclaimed that the king "holds his power only from God."[7] By this statement, however, they nowise meant to limit his rights, but rather to render them absolute and unlimited, like those of God Himself. They recalled the Roman maxim: *"Quidquid placuit principi, legis habet vigorem."*[8] For them the ideal of royalty was no longer to be found in a St. Louis, but in the Caesars of pagan Rome.[9]

Yet it would not be quite exact to say that the legists proclaimed and helped to establish the absolute and personal authority of the king. They set up a limit to royalty, namely, that of their own power. This power they exercised in the king's council, to which they were admitted, and in Parliament, which arrogated to itself the right, not only of administering justice, but of safeguarding the fundamental laws of the land, of registering ordinances and edicts, and of addressing remonstrances to the king. In one parliamentary declaration it is asserted that "the said court is the true seat and throne of the king . . . *ad instar* of the Roman senate."[10]

Such were the legists' doctrines, such was their power. Let us observe them at work in France, England, and Germany, at the courts of Philip the Fair, Edward III, and Louis of Bavaria.

---

[6] Coronation oath, *Archives nationales,* K 1714, f 9. Quoted by Imbart de la Tour, *loc. cit.*

[7] Declaration of Parliament in 1489.

[8] "Whatsoever the prince wills has the force of law."

[9] "Whatsoever the king is pleased to do must be held as law," said the legist-bailiff Beaumanoir, *Coutumes du Beauvoisis,* II, p. 57. A number of legists, like Beaumanoir, no longer invoked the "divine right," but substituted for it "the common good," general welfare, and public utility. See the preambles of decrees quoted by Langlois, *Philippe III,* p. 288.

[10] *Archives nationales,* X, 9323, no. 85, quoted by Imbart de la Tour, p. 43.

Philip the Fair's National Policy

To Philip's initiative and that of his sons has been attributed much of the responsibility for a policy which was due entirely to the legists who surrounded him.[11] More careful historical investigation no longer allows us to regard him as a daring and capable monarch, but rather leads us to consider him a man of weak character, who played only an obscure part.[12] In fact, he is so represented by nearly all of his contemporaries. William Scot, a monk of Saint-Denis, insinuates that Philip was "only a weak man, dominated by his entourage and allowing himself to be swayed by others, rather than a man who directed the policy of his reign." [13] The picture of Philip traced by the pen of his enemy, Bernard de Saisset, is not a mere caricature. "Our king," he says, "is like a horn-owl, the most beautiful of birds, but worthless; he is the handsomest man in the world, but the best he can do is to stare at people without speaking." [14]

It is a far different judgment we must pass on the lawyers who inspired the policy of this French king. Three of them deserve particular mention: Pierre Dubois, Pierre Flote, and William of Nogaret.

Pierre Dubois was born in lower Normandy near Coutances about 1250. After studying law at the University of Paris, where he heard St. Thomas Aquinas preach and Siger of Brabant teaching his commentary on Aristotle's *Politica,* he became one of the most active agents in the destructive work undertaken by the legists. Being a court-lawyer, he strove throughout his life, with passionate energy and "without being over-scrupulous in the choice of means," [15] to extend the rights of the civil government and to destroy ecclesiastical jurisdiction. He dreamed of Philip the Fair dominating Europe and incorporating the papal domain into his own States. Pierre Dubois, says Renan, maintained his ideas "with a boldness that has been exceeded only by the sixteenth century reformers." [16] After breathing into the King of France a hatred for the Church, he entered the service of King Edward the First of England, to play a like part at his court.

---

[11] "The successor of the insignificant Philip the Bold possessed as complete and logical a character as that of St. Louis himself." Henri Martin, *Histoire de France,* IV, p. 391.

[12] "He had a very weak character, and his sons were even more insignificant in the part they took in political life." Langlois, in Lavisse. *Histoire de France,* III, part 2, pp. 120, 122.

[13] *Historiens de la France,* XXI, pref., p. xiv and p. 205.

[14] Quoted by Lavisse, III, part 2, p. 121. Karl Wench, a German writer, has lately tried to defend the earlier opinions as to Philip the Fair. But his arguments do not seem conclusive. See *Bulletin de l'Ecole des Chartes,* May, 1906, p. 272, and *Revue des Questions Historiques,* 1907, p. 556.

Pierre Flote of Auvergne, Philip's chancellor, did not entertain Dubois' vast and revolutionary ideas; but this "little one-eyed lawyer," [17] as Boniface VIII called him, introduced a shameless insolence and brutality into his conduct.

In malice both of these men were surpassed by the Gascon lawyer, William of Nogaret, Philip the Fair's "evil genius," [18] the sacrilegious aggressor against Boniface at Anagni. It has been said that in one sense he deserves to be called a great minister, but that in his company you felt yourself in the land of revolutionary theorists.[19] This descendant of the Vaudois, whose grandfather had been burned at the stake as a Patarin,[20] was himself a true precursor of the Jacobins of 1793.

---

[15] E. Renan, *Pierre du Bois légiste,* in *Histoire littéraire,* XXVI, p. 476

[16] *Ibid.,* p. 484. Until the middle of the last century, scarcely anything was known of Pierre Dubois except his name. But his life and works have been brought to light through the researches of de Wailly and Boutaric. *Mémoires de l'Académie des Inscriptions,* XVIII, part 2, pp. 435 sqq. *Bibliothèque de l'École des Chartes,* second series, III, pp. 273 sqq. *Histoire littéraire,* XXVI, pp. 471 sqq.

[17] *"Belial ille Petrus Flote, semividens corpore, mentique totaliter excaecatus."* Dupuy, *op. cit., preuves,* p. 65.

[18] "William of Nogaret was, for several years, the king's tool." Langlois, in Lavisse, *Histoire de France,* III, part 2, p. 126.

[19] *Histoire littéraire,* XXVII, p. 370.

No one perceived this perfidious influence of the legists more clearly than Boniface VIII. "They are evil councillors," he wrote to the King, "who have inspired you with such false and senseless things. They are the ones who devour the subjects of your realm; they are like those concealed doors which enabled the servants of Baal to remove the offerings secretly. They abuse your protection to steal your goods and the goods of others." [21]

The characteristic note of Philip's policy was not, as has often been alleged, "to make the French nation aware of itself." [22] That such a work was needed at this epoch, and that an ampler autonomy of the different nations would bring about some modifications in the exercise of papal sovereignty, no reasonable mind in the Church denied. This had been undertaken already by St. Louis.

Between the policy of that great king, inspired by a Christian spirit, and that of his grandson, led on by the legists, there was a profound difference. This is plainly pointed out by the German historian, Leopold von Ranke. "We find," he says, "some kings who subordinate their holding the sceptre and even the existence of their kingdom to loftier aims: the maintenance of the order established by God, the progress of civilization, due regard for justice, the accomplishment of the aims of the Church, and the spread of the faith. Others there are who consider themselves as primarily representing their country's interests; the aggrandizement of its power seems to them a purpose glorious in itself. Without hesitation they invade other countries whenever they judge it useful to do so; their destiny and their glory are, in their eyes, to be achieved by the development of their country's internal strength and its external grandeur. Kings of the former type are men of a lofty, humane, religious spirit, who see their power restricted by laws, not with regret, but rather with satisfaction; the others are energetic characters,[23] at times passionate and hard-hearted, men who suffer only the most necessary limitations to their power. The former belong rather to the Middle Ages, the latter to modern times; but both classes are to be met with in all periods of history. After the Capetian race had given the world a St. Louis, the type and model of religious monarchs, it produced a king of the opposite character: this was Philip the Fair." [24] St. Louis, says Guizot, "made his conscience the first rule of his conduct." [25] The French policy under Philip the Fair had as its underlying principle only the pursuit of national interest by every means, or rather, as has been said, "national egotism." [26]

---

[20] Vaissète, *Histoire générale du Languedoc,* IV, p. 551. Raynaldi, *Annales,* 1303, no. 41.

[21] Bull *"Ausculta fili"* (December 5th, 1301); Hefele, *Histoire des conciles,* IX, p. 221.

[22] Laurent, *Études sur l'histoire de l'humanité,* VI, p. 379.

This policy was first manifested in the administration of finances. The efforts of Philip's predecessors resulted in concentrating in the king's hands, for the national defense and good order, the control of immense landed properties, the command of a national army, the direction of more and more numerous and complex administrative functions.

To meet the expenses consequent on this new organization, Philip IV, remarks an impartial historian, had recourse "to financial measures which bore a novel impress of arbitrariness and violence." [27] The fraudulent alteration of the currency, arbitrary taxation, and the calling to France of Jewish and Lombard financiers, who were forced to disgorge after being allowed to grow rich by the most questionable methods [28] —such were some of the measures which gradually aroused the protests of public opinion against the king.[29] Other measures were aimed directly at the property of the Church and the rights of the clergy.

---

[23] We have seen that the legists are to be credited with energy.

[24] Ranke, *Histoire de France,* I, p. 41.

[25] Guizot, *The History of Civilization,* III, p. 243.

[26] It is in reference to this policy, consecrated by the Treaty of Westphalia, that Lavisse writes: "France was the first to put in practice with great splendor the policy of national egoism." (*Histoire de France,* VII, part 1, p. 23.)

[27] Luchaire, *Manuel des institutions françaises au Moyen Age,* p. 594.

It was a principle of canon and civil law, universally admitted in the Middle Ages, that the clergy, while subject to the common law of contributions based on their personal possessions, owed nothing to the State on account of church property, which, as is well known, bore the expense of popular education, public charities, and religious worship. In times of public need the clergy never refused to share the burden by the offering of extraordinary gratuitous donations. For example, under Philip the Bold the French clergy voted important financial aid for the war against Aragon.[30]

---

[28] This was called "squeezing the Jews' sponge."

[29] "We have not found a single historian of the thirteenth or fourteenth century who does not strongly protest against the exactions of the French king. The continuer of Girard de Franchet relates the beginnings of 'that exaction, formerly unheard-of in France, which was called maltote, *malam toltam.* First a hundredth part was required, then a fiftieth of all one's goods. In the beginning the tax was imposed on merchants, but soon it was extended to all laymen, and all the clergy, and throughout the realm.' We find this set forth in similar terms by the other chroniclers of the time; Sismondi sums them up when he says: 'The king's officers at first collected a tax of a hundredth part, then it became a fiftieth; but the arbitrary methods employed and the violence with which seizures were carried out made the maltote more burdensome and objectionable than the amount of the tax would seem to explain.' These last details are taken from Nangis. They show the sore spot. The exactions of the financial administration were often unjust, But even those who uncomplainingly allowed themselves to be stripped were made rebellious by the incomparable insolence of the treasury officers. The subordinates of those days were like those of all countries and all times; they were over-zealous." Gautier, *Etudes et tableaux historiques, Boniface VIII,* p. 244. Cf. *Historiens de la France, Continuatio Girardi de Francheto,* XXI, p. 14; Sismondi, *Histoire de France,* VIII, p. 516. See also Raynaldi, IV, p. 209.

[30] Boutaric, in his conscientious work, *La France sous Philippe le Bel,* makes this judicious remark: "It is oftentimes supposed that in the Middle Ages the clergy did not contribute to the expenses of the State, and that their possessions were exempt from taxation; nothing is farther from the truth. We must distinguish the goods of the Church from those which formed the patrimony of the

The first mistake on the part of Philip the Fair's government was in trying to make these voluntary contributions obligatory and dependent on the arbitrary will of the king.

As early as 1294 Philip obliged all the clergy to vote "a double tithe for two years, beginning at All Saints." Some objections were raised. Several ecclesiastics in the province of Rheims appealed to Pope Boniface;[31] but Philip was not greatly disturbed by these protests. "The clergy were not free to refuse; those ecclesiastics who refused to contribute were exposed to the king's vengeance, who had their temporalities placed under his own hands. The abbots of the Order of Citeaux, in the diocese of Carcassonne, appealed to the immunities which they enjoyed; the seneschal seized their goods and returned them only after the contributions were paid."[32] In 1296 there was another demand for tithes. The bishops met in Paris on May 27th. "They granted, *subject to the pope's approval,* two more tithes, one payable on the next Pentecost, the other on the 29th of the following September, *on condition that they would be collected by the clergy without any interference from the lay authority."*[33] The government treasury officials were not trusted. "If the Church should experience any vexations on the king's part, the collection of the subsidy was to cease."[34] Such were the somewhat too extensive concessions of the French bishops, sub-

---

clergy. The same rule did not apply to both. The clergy were exempt from personal taxation, but they shared the burden of taxation by reason of their personal fortune just as the laity, for the needs of the State and of the local communities to which they belonged." Boutaric, *op. cit.,* p. 177 sqq. The chapters of this work which deal with finance are quite remarkable.

[31] *Ibid.,* pp. 281 sq. See also, in *Historiens de la France,* XXXI, p. 525, the *Inventaire* of Robert Mignon.

[32] Boutaric, *loc. cit.* Boutaric cites an order issued to the seneschal of Beaucoire, directing him to put the Order of Citeaux again in possession of their goods which had been sequestrated, inasmuch as the abbeys of that order had at length promised a subsidy (June, 1295).

[33] *Ibid.,* pp. 283 sq.

[34] *Ibid.,* p. 284.

missive to the dominance of the King, who was as powerful as he was deceitful. But the Order of Citeaux, which had already energetically opposed the imposition of tithes in 1294 and 1295, arose in unanimous protest against the new exactions of the French King.[35] It was their complaint that led Pope Boniface VIII to issue the Bull *"Clericis laicos."*

Even before Boniface VIII's pontificate, the king of France had in another way encroached on the rights of the clergy. By abusing the privilege of the *"regale,"* that is, the pretended right to receive the revenues of a vacant bishopric, a claim which was itself an abuse,[36] he was not satisfied with the ordinary income, but also took some of the landed property, cutting down the forests and exhausting the fish ponds. To the *"regale,"* thus interpreted, he added what he called "the royal safeguard," which extended in a general way to all abbacies and bishoprics that became vacant, under the pretext of protecting their property from attack. Thanks to this so-called safeguard, he was able to lay his hand on the temporalities of all vacant prelatures.[37]

Boniface VIII

At the very time when these odious exactions were being carried out, the Holy See was occupied by the pious but inexperienced Celestine V,[38] whom popular enthusiasm had snatched from his hermitage and conducted to the Chair of Peter. With justice did a certain prudent historian write: "You might call him an angel, but it was a man that was needed." [39] This pontiff, who fled from the society of men, who had a little wooden cell built in the papal palace, where he might shut himself in and pray,[40] soon perceived that it was his duty to lay down the burden of the pontificate. At times he was heard groaning and murmuring: "My God, while I reign over souls, I am losing my own!" There was a greatness in the courage with which he abdicated the tiara, resumed his anchorite life, and therein devoted himself to humility, prayer, and mortification, which placed him in the number of the saints.[41]

---

[35] Kervyn, *Recherches,* pp. 16 sq.; Boutaric, p. 284.

[36] At this period the ecclesiastical canons granted to the king only the right to watch over the vacant benefices, to reserve their profits for the future titulary, and to appoint to a benefice when its title was of royal patronage. See Thomassin, *Ancienne et nouvelle discipline,* part 3, bk. 2, 54.

[37] Boutaric, pp. 69 sqq.; Hefele, IX, pp. 213 sq.

[38] *"Homo Dei in rebus secularibus minus expertus."* Duchesne, *Liber pontificalis,* II, p. 468.

Eleven days later (December 24th, 1294), the College of Cardinals elevated to the supreme pontificate a man of energy and perspicacity, one familiar with public affairs, such as the Church had need of, Cardinal Benedetto Gaetani, who took the name of Boniface VIII.

He was born of a noble family of Spanish origin in the old city of Anagni at the foot of the Apennines, some time between 1210 and 1230.[42] His ardent and generous soul was early pained at the evils which the papacy had to suffer from the harsh violence of Frederick II and the excessive ambition of Charles of Anjou. Like most sons of noble families of that period, he studied law. Historians have considered him one of the most illustrious doctors of the University of Paris.[43] There he studied civil law and especially ecclesiastical law with so great success that his fame was widespread. In the various embassies on which he was sent to Rudolph, king of the Romans, Charles of Anjou, king of Sicily, and Philip the Fair, king of France, Benedetto Gaetani had an opportunity to train himself in the business of ecclesiastical and secular affairs. But throughout his life he remained first of all a lawyer, and it is said that he was the greatest canonist of his day. His diplomatic mission to France brought him into relation with Philip the Fair; his sojourn at the University of Paris put him in touch with those legists who were to become the most formidable adversaries of his policy.

---

[39] Christophe, *Histoire de la papauté pendant le XIVe siècle,* I, p. 73.

[40] *"Fabricata intra palatium lignea camerula se concludebat."* Manhaeus Vagius, in *Vita Celestini,* quoted by Christophe, *l.c.*

[41] Petrarch raised to heaven the sublime act of St. Celestine's abdication (*De vita solitaria,* bk. 2, sect. 3, ch. 18), whereas Dante placed among those "who lived withouten infamy or praise" him "who made through cowardice the great refusal." Longfellow's translation of the *Inferno,* canto III, vv. 36, 60. Cf. *Acta Sanctorum,* May, IV; *Liber pontificalis,* II, pp. 467 sqq.

[42] Tosti, *History of Pope Boniface VIII and his Times,* p. 37.

[43] Duboulay, *Historia Universitatis Parisiensis.* Catalog. III acad., vol. III, p. 676.

The Roman law, to the study of which the clergy devoted themselves during the Middle Ages,[44] had become an object of suspicion to the Church, not only because it turned their minds away from theological studies,[45] but especially because it was conceived in a spirit of hostility to the Church and because emperors and kings had already taken undue advantage of it.[46] Pope Honorius had issued a Bull (November 1219) forbidding all religious and clerics to study Roman law under pain of ecclesiastical censure.[47] Benedetto Gaetani passionately devoted himself to the study of canon law, which became more and more the arsenal for supplying the Church with arms for the struggle in which she was engaged. This venerable discipline, which proudly gloried in holding the loftiest rank in the hierarchy of sciences,[48] which called itself *theologia rectrix* and *theologia practica,* may have borrowed its absolute principles and dialectical methods too much from dogmatic theology [49] and may have been too prone to judge the force of ecclesiastical laws according to abstract and speculative maxims. It did not take sufficient account of historical circumstances.[50] The Roman law, on the other hand, with its ambition to govern the world, tended overmuch to subordinate the principles and conclusions of the old lawyers to this ambition. A great conflict was about to break out between Boniface VIII and the government of Philip the Fair. May it not be that its prelude is to be found in the class-room argumentations in which the student of the Decretals and future author of the *Liber Sextus* tried his strength against the commentators of the Pandects? At all events, the struggle in which he will one day engage for the defense of the Church will be not merely the tragic duel of two powers, one of which will have all the impetuous force of an assailant and the other all the desperate energy of one besieged; it will be, in fact, a conflict of the two personifications of law at that period—the Gallican legist and the Roman canonist.

---

[44] Savigny, *The History of the Roman Law during the Middle Ages.* Cf. *Corpus juris canonici,* Decret., pars 1, dist. 10, cap. 13.

[45] Cap. X, *Super specula,* tit. 50, lib. 3, Decretal.

[46] Périès, *La faculté de droit dans l'ancienne Université de Paris,* pp. 95 sqq.

[47] Cap. X, *loc. cit.*

[48] See the article on "Kirchenrecht" in Wetzer and Welte's *Kirchenlexikon.*

[49] Viollet, *Histoire du droit français,* pp. 31 sqq.

As a canonist, such as those times understood the term, Boniface will sometimes employ a somewhat too abstract and rigid argumentation; as a combatant defending a threatened fortress, he will use a too ready vivacity. But we shall see his great soul inspiring him with a generous love of truth; we shall see him promptly explain, comment, and adjust to existing circumstances, some maxim, stated in an absolute form, which a first impulse had dictated to him. To be just toward Boniface, we must consider together his letters proclaiming principles and those subsequently regulating the application of those principles; we must interpret the words of the canonical expert by the practical and moderate explanations of the common father of the faithful.

When, upon his elevation to the pontificate (Christmas, 1294), the new Pope surveyed the Christendom which he knew so well, we can understand why, dreading the heavy burden he was assuming, he took for his motto, *"Deus in adjutorium meum intende."* [51]

---

[50] *Kirchenlexikon, loc. cit.*

Europe was aflame. The strife of Albert of Austria against Adolph of Nassau was rending the Holy Empire. France and England had come to blows. Internal convulsions were disturbing Italy. Guelfs and Ghibellines were wrestling for power in Florence and Rome. To the north, the king of Denmark was persecuting the Church. The Holy Land was in the hands of the infidels and, when recent popes had tried to awaken the old crusading ardor, princes and peoples, engaged in fighting one another or in safeguarding their material interests, remained almost deaf to these appeals. The old faith of the Middle Ages was grown cold in the hearts of men. Christian art had lost its traditional symbolism and was entering upon a path of realism which was to become a new expression of religious feeling, but at first was disconcerting.

Boniface, relying on the divine help which he had just implored, planned from the very first days of his pontificate to restore the ancient splendor of medieval Christendom. To pacify peoples and kings, to unite them in a new crusade for the conquest of the tomb of Christ, to revive piety in men's souls, and to renew Christian art—such were the aims he pursued until his death. The painful struggles he had to sustain against the king of France sometimes diverted him from his path, but he returned to it with tireless perseverance, which we can follow almost day by day in the Register of his correspondence.[52]

Boniface was consecrated January 23rd, 1295.[53] The very next day he wrote to King Edward of England and King Philip of France, exhorting them to love and respect justice;[54] three weeks later it was to the city of Venice, then at war with Genoa, that he addressed similar exhortations, recalling the memory of the peace of Christendom and the conquest of the Holy Land;[55] six days later he wrote to Edward and Philip, offering his mediation and for this purpose sending them two cardinals as legates.[56] The hostilities between France and England threatened to involve all Europe in fire and blood. King Eric of Norway, Rudolph, former king of the Romans and rival of Adolph of Nassau, Count Florent of Holland, Count Otto IV of Flanders, King Baliol of Scotland, many nobles greedy for conquest, cities and communes of Castile eager for gain, took the side of Philip, while Adolph of Nassau and John of Richemont, duke of Brittany, gave their support to King Edward. Neither the legates' entreaties, fortified and encouraged by pressing letters from the Pope, nor the steps taken by Boniface VIII with Adolph of Nassau, succeeded in appeasing the belligerents. Not satisfied with continuing the war, Philip, hard pressed for funds, violated the rights of his people by coining false money.[57] His ally, Eric of Denmark, contrary to the immunities of the clergy and without respect for the goods of the Church, pillaged the bishops and put one of them, the Archbishop of Lunden, in chains. Boniface addressed King Eric in a noble and paternal protest, asking that ambassadors be sent to Rome to enable him to work for the reëstablishment of peace in the kingdom of Denmark.[58]

---

[51] "Come unto my help, O God."

[52] See *Les registres de Boniface VIII,* by Digard, Faucon, and Thomas; also Potthast, *Regesta pontificum romanorum,* vol. IV.

[53] Potthast, IV, p. 1924, no. 24019.

If you were to go through all the letters written by the new Pope at this period, you would see that, in fulfilling the rôle of mediator which the public law of the Middle Ages assigned to him and which, moreover, he alone was able to perform amidst the divisions and almost universal hatreds of the times, not a word fell from his pen but breathed a spirit of peace and condescension.

---

[54] *Ibid.,* no. 24020.

[55] *Ibid.,* no. 24022.

[56] *Ibid.,* no. 24027.

[57] Tosti, *op. cit.,* p. 137.

[58] Reg. Vat., an. II, ep. 59.

The Bull *"Clericis laicos"*

A time came, however, when the Pontiff's respect for justice and his duty to protect the goods of the Church obliged him to employ the spiritual arms belonging to his office. Unscrupulous usurers infested the diocese of Autun; Boniface VIII ordered the bishop to expel them for good.[59] He directed the bishop of Metz to disinter the remains of a famous usurer and cast them outside consecrated ground.[60] The bishop of Arles, the bishop of Marseilles, the judges of Lucania and those of Pisa and Orvieto made no protest against the laity usurping church property. Boniface summoned them to be judged, and punished them with canonical censures.[61] The Church was also threatened by a less apparent but more dangerous abuse. The desire to win the favor of princes often led the clergy to dispose of property, offered to God for the needs of divine worship and of the poor, to the profit of these princes, under the guise of gifts, aids, or tokens of gratitude. The watchful Pontiff believed that the moment had come to decree a general measure to cure these abuses. Such was the object of the famous constitution *"Clericis laicos"* (February 25th, 1296), which was destined to stir up so much hatred against him.

"The history of olden times teaches, and daily experience proves," said the Pope, "that the laity have always felt hostile to the clergy and have constantly striven to overstep their bounds by wickedness and disobedience. They do not reflect that all power over the clergy, over persons and property of the Church is denied them. They lay heavy burdens on prelates, churches, and both regular and secular clergy, crush them with taxes, taking sometimes half, at other times a tenth, a twentieth, or some other portion of their revenues, trying to reduce them to slavery in a thousand ways. In the bitterness of our soul we must add that certain prelates and other ecclesiastical persons, fearful when there is nothing for them to fear, seek a fugitive peace and dread a temporal majesty more than the eternal majesty by lending themselves to these abuses, less through temerity than imprudence, but without obtaining due faculty and authorization from the Holy See."

---

[59] *Ibid.*, an. I, ep. 59.

[60] *Ibid.*, an. I, ep. 508; cf. Tosti, p 165.

[61] Reg. Vat., an. I, ep. 146, 150, 151, 223, 315.

Then follow the weighty censures of the Church. "To cut short these abuses, we, in accord with the cardinals and by virtue of our apostolic authority, ordain the following: All prelates and, in general all persons belonging to the Church, monks or secular clergy, who, without the consent of the Apostolic See, pay or promise to pay to laymen any imposts, taxes, tithe or half-tithe, or even a hundredth part or any portion whatsoever of their revenues or of the goods of their churches by way of subvention, loan, gift, subsidy, etc., as also emperors, kings, princes, barons, rectors, etc., who levy the same, who exact them or receive them, or who even put their hand on valuables placed in the churches or who cooperate in this sort of act, all these persons *ipso facto* incur excommunication. We interdict communities that preach in defense of these condemned acts. Under penalty of deposition, we order prelates and all churchmen not to permit these taxes to be collected without the express consent of the Apostolic See, not to pay them, not even though they allege the pretext that a promise of this sort has been made before the publication of the present decree. Even in this case, if these persons pay and if the laymen receive such payments, both incur *ipso* *facto* excommunication. Moreover, no one may absolve from this excommunication or interdict unless he receives from the Apostolic See full power so to do; the one only exception being the case of a person at the hour of death. For we have decided to tolerate no longer this astounding abuse of the civil power; and no privilege granted to any king—for example, that of never being excommunicated—may constitute an obstacle to the execution of this present decree." [62]

Whenever Boniface, no longer addressing an individual, rises to the realm of principles, he proclaims them with an inflexibility which he doubtless received from the scholastic methods of his time and which was of a sort to wound those who were ill-disposed towards him. Besides, in this Bull one senses the unrestrained irritation of an ardent spirit.[63]

At bottom, the papal document introduced nothing new and only recalled to mind the existing law.[64] Yet it was, in the words of Bossuet, "the spark that lighted a conflagration." [65]

Each ruler received the Bull according to his own dispositions. In Germany, Adolph of Nassau, sufficiently occupied with his financial difficulties and with the silent opposition that was already developing against him, accepted it with respect. A diocesan synod held in Cambrai, then German territory, decreed that the Bull be translated into the vulgar tongue and read to the people four times a year.[66]

The brutal Edward of England flew into a passion. Being hard pressed for money by his war with John of Scotland

---

[62] *Sext. Decret.*, lib. 3, tit. 23, *De immun. eccles.*, cap. 3. Potthast, IV, no. 24291.

[63] It is in this sense that Hefele writes: "The effect of the publication of this Bull was most unfortunate." (*Histoire des conciles*, IX, p. 182.)

[64] In Thomassin it can be seen that the Bull purely and simply renews a doctrine which was traditional in the Church and which had been accepted in principle by all the States up to that time. (Thomassin, *op. cit.*, part 3, bk. 1, ch. 43, no. 9.)

[65] Bossuet, *Defensio declarationis conventus cleri Gallicani, anno 1682*, part 2, bk. 7, ch. 23.

[66] Hartzheim, *Concilia Germaniae*, IV, pp. 89 sqq.

and his preparations for a campaign against the king of France, that prince crushed the churches with all sorts of taxes. By way of reply to the Bull, he redoubled his violent acts. But he encountered the heroic resistance of the clergy. At a council which met, by royal mandate, at St. Paul's in London, the bishops courageously proclaimed their unanimous adherence to the papal constitution. Neither imprisonment nor exile nor any sort of violence was able to overcome the admirable church of England, gathered about the valiant Archbishop Robert of Canterbury. Edward later on had to disavow his conduct and regret his mistake.

In the attitude of the French king it is not difficult to recognize the influence of the crafty legists who surrounded him. Without making any allusion to the act of the Holy See, Philip forbade his subjects, both clergy and laity, "to transport or send any silver, whether coined or not, beyond the realm, even out of devotion to the Holy See." This measure was intended to cut off one of the most abundant sources of papal revenue and was an open violation of the canons of the Church, which forbade secular powers to interfere in the administration or distribution of these revenues.

The Pope was not deceived as to the meaning and origin of this measure. He wrote to Philip: "See where your wretched advisers have led you. . . . Such was not the conduct of your ancestors." Then, after reminding the King of what the Holy See had done for France and the solicitude which he himself had for that great nation, he reduced to their real significance the prohibitions decreed by his letter. "We have not decreed," he said, "that ecclesiastics should not contribute to the defense and wants of the kingdom, but that our leave is necessary for such subsidies in order to put a stop to the unbearable exactions of your agents over the clergy. In cases of need we would rather sell the sacred vessels and crosses of the churches than expose to the least danger a kingdom like France, always so dear and devoted to the Holy See." [67] In a second letter Boniface was still more explicit. "As it is an author's right to explain the meaning of his words," he wrote to the King, "so we make the following declaration, both for your tranquillity and that of your successors. If a prelate or any other cleric of your realm wishes voluntarily and without pressure to make you a gift or even a loan, our Bull contains nothing opposed thereto, not even should a friendly and courteous invitation to make such a gift be extended either on your part or that of your officials. It is needless to add that the Bull has not in mind the dues to which prelates may be bound by virtue of the fiefs which they hold. Exemption is also made for those cases of necessity in which the Holy See cannot be consulted, because of the *periculum in mora*." [68]

This last point was developed in a final letter. The Pope ruled that it would pertain to the reigning king, his successors, or, in case of the king's minority, to the States, to declare "danger of delay" which would permit the raising of subsidies from the goods of the clergy without the supreme pontiff's permission.[69]

These explanations removed every pretext for opposition on the King's part. Philip withdrew his prohibition and even allowed to be published in France the Pope's order directing the renewal of the truce between France and England under pain of excommunication.

---

[67] Bull "*Ineffabilis*" (September 25th, 1296), quoted in Tosti, p. 170. See Raynaldi, IV, pp. 210, sqq., and Potthast, IV, no. 24398.

[68] Letter "*Romana mater Ecclesia*" (February 7th, 1297); Potthast, IV, no. 24468; Raynaldi, 1297, sec. 49.

[69] Letter "*Etsi de statu*" (July 31st, 1297). Potthast, no. 24553; Raynaldi, 1297, sec. 50. Cf. Potthast, no. 24549. In the accounts published by Guigniau and Natalis de Wailly in volume XXI of *Historiens de la France*, pp. 529 sqq., can be found indicated all the tithes which Pope Boniface VIII authorized to be raised in France from 1297. These "collections" end in 1307, three years after the outrage of Anagni.

The work of pacification in justice seemed to triumph. Boniface took advantage of the calm to hasten King Louis IX's process of canonization. In August, 1297, a solemn Bull addressed to all the bishops and archbishops of France placed the illustrious ancestor of Philip IV on the altars and fixed the celebration of the saint's feast on the day after St. Bartholomew's.[70] "It was a cause of great joy," says Joinville, "and rightly so for the whole realm of France. And it should be a great honor for all his lineage who strive to imitate him in doing good, and a great dishonor to all those of his lineage who wish to do evil; for they will be pointed out and it will be said that their descent from that holy king makes their wickedness the more odious." [71]

The Question of Papal Supremacy

While Joinville was writing these lines, St. Louis' grandson was justifying their eloquent severity by his conduct. Under the inspiration of the legists, his adherence was doubtful, his obedience mingled with reservations, his deference incomplete. If he did, in fact, accept the publication of the truce ordered by the Pope, it was with a protest that, as a matter of right, he was responsible to no one for his temporal government; [72] if the next year (1298) he bowed to the arbitration decision which Boniface pronounced as Pope between him and his rival, it was with a complaint that the Pope had favored England.[73] He professed devotion to the Holy See, but he welcomed about him the Supreme Pontiff's worst enemies.

The most redoubtable of these were Cardinals Giacomo and Pietro Colonna, belonging to the powerful Colonna family

[70] Potthast, no. 24561.

[71] *Historiens de la France,* XX, p. 303.

[72] Dupuy, p. 28.

[73] Hefele, IX, p. 203.

of Rome. Since Boniface's election they had constantly intrigued against him and become the center of a formidable opposition. Gathered about these two rebellious cardinals might be seen the partisans of the house of Aragon and the "Fratricelli," those descendants of the "spiritual Franciscans" who claimed to maintain the pure teaching of St. Francis against later deformations and who had received some encouragement from Pope Celestine V. These opponents charged that Boniface, the crafty supplanter of Celestine, had obtained the latter's resignation by force and was not the legitimate pope.[74] Inflammatory poems and vehement pamphlets by Jacopone da Todi gave form and breath and, as it were, wings to the insurrection. Giacomo and Pietro Colonna, uncle and nephew, were deprived of their dignities by a papal decree of May 10th, 1297;[75] they had started an open revolt. A real war, a "crusade," was organized by Boniface against the rebels and was led by nobles who exercised that pitiless severity which so often marks the suppression of uprisings. The trouble came to an end with the destruction of the chateaux and fortresses occupied by the insurgents and with the imprisonment of the two leaders. But they escaped and accused Boniface of having broken his word to reinstate them in their honors. They took refuge at the court of the French king.

Albert of Austria, another enemy of Boniface, sought Philip's support. He was "a harsh man, of pitiless character, with a somber and calculating mind, mean and unscrupulous."[76] He had himself elected to replace Adolph of Nassau, whom, it is said, he had killed with his own hand in a battle that took place July 2nd, 1298. But Boniface accused him of having attacked Adolph treasonably, declared him unworthy of the empire, and, reserving to himself the right to dispose of the German crown, summoned Albert to appear before him. Albert turned to Philip, swearing vengeance on the Pope. Later on he was obliged to break off this French alliance, which had no bond save that of a common resentment, and as a matter of policy, to be reconciled to Pope Boniface.

---

[74] It is quite possible that Boniface VIII advised St. Celestine V to abdicate. It is beyond doubt that to prevent Celestine becoming, in intriguers' hands, a cause of disturbance, Boniface secured the person of the good and holy monk. But these acts, for which Boniface was bitterly blamed by his foes, should be considered acts of prudence and wisdom.

[75] Potthast, no. 24513.

[76] Georges Blondel, in Lavisse and Rambaud, *Histoire générale,* III, p. 611.

It was at this moment that the legists of the French king, intoxicated with ambition, formed the design of a universal monarchy, established for Philip the Fair's benefit, including the annexation to the French realm of all other States, not even excepting the Empire of Constantinople or the States of the Church, which latter were to be confiscated and secularized.[77] Pierre Dubois proposed to King Philip to have the Pope accept a pension equal to the income from the Patrimony of St. Peter. "The Supreme Pontiff," he wrote, "is so burdened with spiritual cares that he should be considered unable to give proper attention to the government of his temporalities without prejudice to spiritual interests. Deducting expenses and other necessary liabilities, and reckoning what remains for the Pope from the profits and revenues of his domain, it would be better to give them in perpetual emphysteutic lease to some great prince or king on condition of an annual pension." In another memorandum he returns to this idea, which had made Frederick II smile when Dubois proposed to Innocent IV to take the lands of the Church for the payment of a quit-rent. He wrote: "By the mediation of the king of Sicily it will be possible to have the Roman Church declare that the title of Senator of Rome belongs to the king of France, who would exercise its functions by a delegate, and who would also be able to obtain the Patrimony of the Church with the duty of estimating how much is derived from the city of Rome, Tuscany, the seacoast, the mountains, etc., in order to pay to the pope the amounts that he ordinarily derives therefrom, and to receive in exchange the homage of kings and the obedience of cities . . . with all the revenues that the pope is accustomed to receive. The supreme pontiff should claim merely the glory of pardoning, and devote his time to reading, preaching, and prayer." [78]

---

[77] Hefele, IX, p. 209.

But what contrasts in human affairs! At the very time when these advisers of the French king were cherishing such strange projects, the Pope, moved by the great success of the jubilee celebrations of 1300, which had brought more than 200,000 persons to the tomb of the Apostles, thought that he could revive the old ideal of Christendom in all its power and glory.

In the course of a jubilee sermon in the Pope's presence, Cardinal Aquasparta, Boniface's confidant, maintained that "the pope alone enjoys spiritual and temporal sovereignty over all men, in place of God." The following year, on the occasion of the election of the king of Hungary, Boniface himself wrote: "The Roman pontiff, established by God above kings and kingdoms in the Church militant, is the supreme head of the hierarchy." [79] As the most living expression of Christendom seemed to the Pope to be an alliance of all Christian peoples armed for the crusade, and as his uppermost thought had always been the deliverance of the Holy Land, he deemed the hour had come to summon princes and people to take up the cross. The encounter of these two imposing ideas was to be tragic.

The Pope appointed Bernard de Saisset, bishop of Pamiers, to notify Philip of the Crusade. This unfortunate choice pro-

---

[78] Quoted by de Wailly in *Mémoires de l'Académie des Inscriptions*, XVIII, p. 443. De Wailly shows that Pierre Dubois' memoir should be dated 1300, for its author speaks of the marriage of Blanche of France with Rudolph of Austria, which took place at the beginning of 1300.

[79] Potthast, no. 25080.

DOMINICAN COLLEGE LIBRARY SAN RAFAEL

voked hostilities. Bernard de Saisset was known as a man who did not like the French and took little pains to conceal the fact. He had hopes of a greater autonomy for his native country of Languedoc. Whereas he was a personal friend of Boniface VIII, who had entrusted him with several confidential missions, he detested Philip IV, and particularly Pierre Flote, whose affliction prompted him to say maliciously that in the kingdom of the blind the one-eyed is king. On the night of July 12th, 1301, the episcopal palace of Pamiers was surrounded, the Bishop's temporalities placed under the King's hand, and his papers seized. The Bishop was brought before the King at Senlis and subjected to a scorching examination by Pierre Flote, who accused him of the most abominable crimes, besides the complaints attested by witnesses.

The trial continued and would doubtless have led to a severe punishment for the Bishop, when the Pope, informed of the progress of the affair, intervened (December 4th, 1301) by publishing the Bull *"Salvator mundi."* As in the Bull *"Clericis laicos,"* Boniface took occasion of the case in dispute to proclaim one of those general theories, the unqualified enunciation of which so deeply wounded the French legists. "The Vicar of Christ," he said, "can suspend, revoke, or modify the statutes, privileges, and concessions emanating from the Holy See, without the fulness of his authority being restricted by any disposition whatsoever." [80] Consequently, he revoked the permissions previously granted in the matter of raising subsidies for the defense of the State. The next day, in a new Bull, beginning *"Ausculta fili,"* he declared that, as God had established him, the Supreme Pontiff, above kings and kingdoms, "to build up, to plant, to pluck up, and to destroy, the King of France must not let himself suppose he has no superior," for "that would be the thought of a fool, an infidel." Then he summoned the bishops of France to meet in Rome on November 1st, 1302 for the purpose of leading the King of France back into the right path. "Assuredly," he wrote, addressing the King, "we would have the right to employ arms against you, the bow and quiver; but we prefer to deliberate with the ecclesiastical persons of your realm." [81]

---

[80] *Ibid.*, no. 25096.

Philip had the Bull *"Ausculta fili"* solemnly burned; or did its destruction take place by accident? History has not yet made the matter quite clear.[82] It is certain, however, that a false and misleading summary of the Bull was drawn up by a legist, probably Pierre Flote, which makes the Pope say to Philip: "We wish you to know that you are subject to us in both temporal and spiritual things." [83] This was to insinuate that Boniface intended treating Philip as a suzerain his vassal. At the same time a letter from the King of France, which was never sent to Rome, was circulated by the legists to arouse public opinion. It began in this wise: "Philip, by the grace of God, King of the French, to Boniface, who giveth himself out for Sovereign Pontiff, little or no greeting. Let thy Extreme Fatuity know that we are subject to no one in things temporal, etc." [84] Finally, by way of reply to the Pope, who had convoked a council for November 1st, 1302, Philip summoned for April of the same year the representatives of the three orders of the realm, nobles, clergy, and common people (*gens du commun*), "to deliberate about matters of the highest concern to the King and the kingdom."

This assembly, convened April 10th, 1302, in the Church of Notre Dame de Paris, was the first meeting of the States General. "This assembling of the States General by Philippe-le-Bel," says Michelet somewhat pompously, "constitutes the national era of France, its baptismal register." [85] In reality, the institution of the States General, in so far as it was liberal and democratic, was only the application of one of the traditional principles of the Middle Ages—"the right to consent to public burdens, to be summoned to exercise control over the established government, and to govern itself." [86] The growing importance of the bourgeoisie and of rural communities at the beginning of the fourteenth century did not permit them to be neglected in the public consultations of the nation. Moreover, it is now asserted that there was nothing democratic in Philip's intentions when, in summoning the States General of 1302, he instructed his bailiffs and seneschals "to select as representatives men who are ready to hear and accept the royal decisions, with express command to proceed against those who would not obey the King's orders." [87] As to the real aim of the convention, it appeared from the first words of the speech of Pierre Flote, who opened the deliberations: it was to set the French nation in opposition to the Pope. "A certain letter from the Pope," he said, "has been brought to us by the Archbishop of Narbonne, declaring that we are subject to the Pope in the temporal administration of this kingdom; and that to him and not to God alone, as has always been believed, do we owe our crown." [88] Here again we have an exaggeration of the Pope's words, transforming his doctrine of "supremacy" into a claim of "suzerainty."

---

[81] *Ibid.*, no. 25097.

[82] Rocquain in *Bibliothèque de l'École des Chartes*, 1883, pp. 383 sqq.

[83] Quoted in Tosti, *op. cit.*, p. 332.

[84] *Ibid.*, p. 337.

[85] Michelet, *History of France*, I, p. 354.

The minds of the members of the assembly had already been prepared by the publication of the pretended papal Bull and of the letter drawn up in the King's name. The nobles declared themselves ready to pour out their blood for the crown.

---

[86] Imbart de la Tour, *Questions d'histoire sociale et religieuse, Époque féodale,* p. 180.

[87] See a manuscript in the Bibliothèque Nationale (Ms. lat. 17534, p. 511), reproduced in the *Bibliothèque de l'École des Chartes,* 1906, pp. 470 sqq. Cf. in the *Collection des documents inédits sur l'histoire de France,* the volume which Georges Picot devotes to *Documents relatifs aux États généraux et assemblées réunies sous Philippe le Bel.*

[88] Tosti, p. 335.

The representatives of the communes adhered to the King's declarations. As for the embarrassed clergy, they sent a message to the Supreme Pontiff, begging him to withdraw his prohibitions "so as not to destroy the ancient union that exists between the Church, the king, and the realm."

As he had done in the matter of the interpretation of the Bull *"Clericis laicos,"* the Pope protested against the falsification to which the legists had subjected his letters. "The letters which, after mature deliberation and in accord with the advice of our brethren, we sent to the King, have been falsified by Pierre Flote, that heretic, that Achitopel . . . Pierre Flote will be punished both in spirituals and temporals. He makes it appear that we ordered the King to acknowledge that he holds his kingdom from us. For forty years we have studied law and have learned that on earth two powers, the temporal and the spiritual, have been ordained by God. . . . We have no wish to encroach on the King's jurisdiction; but the King cannot deny that he is subject to us from the point of view of any violation of the divine law, *ratione peccati."* [89]

When thus clarified, the doctrine of the pope's supreme jurisdiction could not give rise to the least objection on the part of a Christian ruler. Philip the Fair was more humiliated by the defeat which he suffered at Courtrai (July 11th, 1302) from the Flemish militia than by the papal letter. The new power of modern times, the bourgeoisie, now turned against the foe of the papacy. Pierre Flote perished in the battle, and the people, recalling the Pope's words, "that Pierre Flote will be punished both in spirituals and in temporals," viewed his death as a divine punishment.

When, in spite of the King's prohibition, four archbishops and thirty-five bishops betook themselves to Rome for the synod of November 1st, Philip did not dare to protest.

The chief event of the Roman synod was the publication by the Pope of his celebrated Bull *"Unam sanctam,"* which has been called "the most absolute proclamation of Catholic doctrine in the Middle Ages." [90]

---

[89] Raynaldi, 1302, no. 12; Potthast, no. 25184.

The Supreme Pontiff, once more rising to the realm of principles, and without seeming to make the least reference to the men and events of his time, set forth that "in the power of the Church there are two swords, the spiritual and the temporal—the latter to be used for the Church, the former by the Church; the former by the hand of the priest, the latter by the hand of kings and soldiers, but with the consent and at the pleasure of the priest, *ad nutum et patientiam sacerdotis.*" The Pope goes on to say that "if the temporal power goes astray, it will be judged by the spiritual power, and since this is the supreme power, it can be judged only by God." "Consequently," he concludes, "we say, declare, and define that to be subject to the Roman pontiff is necessary for salvation, for every human creature." [91] Certainly this last phrase, which alone has the force of a dogmatic definition, contains nothing that cannot be accepted by those who are most jealous of the temporal independence of civil governments. It is evidently *ratione peccati,* simply from the viewpoint of sin, that every human creature is placed under the supreme jurisdiction of the head of the Church. If those who favored the Bull should go farther in their claims, they would merely be reproducing a public right universally accepted in the Middle Ages and still more forcibly expressed in the eleventh, twelfth, and thirteenth centuries by Geoffrey of Vendome, St. Bernard,[92] Hugh of St. Victor,[93] and Alexander of Hales.[94] After the lengthy discussions of the intervening centuries, impartial minds now acknowledge that at bottom Boniface, in this Bull as in the *"Clericis laicos,"* uttered no great novelty.[95] Undoubtedly, if circumstances had left him time, the Pontiff would have taken occasion to show his adversaries the true import of his doctrine; but the sudden turn of fortune in the violent struggle which soon sprang up did not allow him to do so.

---

[90] Langlois in Lavisse, *Histoire de France,* III, part 2, p. 153.

[91] *"Porro subesse romano Pontifici omni humanae creaturae declaramus, dicimus, definimus et pronunciamus omnino esse de necessitate salutis."* (Raynaldi, 1302, no. 13; Potthast, no. 25189.)

[92] St. Bernard, *On Consideration,* bk. 4, ch. 3. (*P.L.,* vol. 182, col. 776.)

[93] Hugh of St. Victor, *De sacramentis,* bk. 2, chaps. 2, 4 (*P.L.,* vol. 176, col. 418.)

[94] Alexander of Hales, *Summa theologica,* IV, q. 10, m. 5, a. 2. For example, the Pope, not satisfied with declaring that "if the temporal power goes astray, it will

The Anagni Outrage

The King, crushed by the disaster at Courtrai and, as it were, overwhelmed by the loss of Pierre Flote, at first gave a favorable reception to a questionnaire presented to him by the Pope following the publication of the Bull and respectfully agreed to discuss the Pope's grievances. It may also be that he wanted to gain time. But as soon as William of Nogaret took the place left vacant by Pierre Flote, events began to be precipitated.

The end of 1302 was approaching. In December the prelates and barons of the realm were convoked "to consult in the matter of safeguarding the honor and independence of the kingdom." The King cleverly chose his ground by once again presenting the papal declarations as an attempt to claim the kingdom of France as a fief of the Holy See. Then, while an effort was made to prolong the conference with the Pope, Nogaret conceived a most audacious plan—nothing less than seizing the Pope in Italy, bringing him to France, and having

be judged by the spiritual power," gives the following reason for the papal supremacy: "It belongs to the spiritual power to establish the earthly power and to judge it if it is not good (*nam veritate testante, spiritualis potestas terrenam potestatem instituere habet et judicare si bona non fuerit*"). It has been maintained that in this passage the word *"instituere"* does not mean to "establish," but "to direct morally." Hugh of St. Victor's text, however, from which Boniface VIII borrows his expression, is very clear, for it reads: *"instituere ut sit."*

[95] Langlois in Lavisse, *Histoire de France,* III, part 2, p. 154.

him judged by a national council. The Colonnas, who had sought refuge at Philip's court, promised their coöperation.

On March 7th, 1303, William of Nogaret with some trusted French and Italian companions received from the royal chancery a mysterious commission to deal in the King's name "with every person, noble, ecclesiastical, or other whatsoever, for any league or agreement of mutual aid in men or money." On June 13th and 14th, Guillaume de Plaisians, a *chevalier ès-lois,* Nogaret's right-hand man, stirred up popular manifestations before the Louvre under the King's eyes and had the future council acclaimed. Emissaries were commissioned to travel throughout France for the purpose of arousing an opinion favorable to the King and of spreading the worst calumnies against the Pope. The latter, informed of this procedure, drew up, but did not yet promulgate, the Bull *"Super Petri solio"* (September 8th), in which, after recalling the whole history of the quarrel and summing up his grievances, he pronounced excommunication against the King of France, whose subjects he absolved from their oath of allegiance. Nogaret, informed of the imminent promulgation of the Bull, decided there was no time to lose. He interviewed the Pope's enemies and, among the exiles, malcontents, and bandits of the locality, recruited a force of men to which were soon added the ferocious Sciarra Colonna and his family followers. Nogaret then turned his steps towards Anagni, where Boniface was residing at the time.

At daybreak on September 7th, the troop of mercenaries, with the fleur-de-lis banner of France and the gonfalon of St. Peter at its head, rushed into the public square of Anagni with cries of "Long live the King of France and Colonna!" Then they poured into the church, from which they hoped to enter the adjoining papal palace. It was not till nightfall, after a day of pillage, that the aggressors succeeded in forcing an entrance to the papal residence, The aged Pontiff was awaiting them, seated on a throne, wearing the tiara and cope, and holding in his hands the keys and the cross. "Since, like the Savior, I am betrayed and my end is nigh," he said, "I shall at least die as becomes a pope." Cardinal Boccasini, who later became Benedict XI, and Cardinal Pierre d'Espagne were standing beside him. As a modern writer says, "history has nothing but admiration for those Roman elders who seated themselves on their curule chairs to wait for the arrival of the Gauls; the action of Boniface was even nobler and more dignified." [96]

There is no contemporary witness that confirms the tradition according to which Nogaret or Sciarra Colonna struck the Pope. But no abuse, no threat was spared him. With unruffled dignity, he replied to Sciarra's furious gestures, merely by saying: *"Eccovi il capo, eccovi il collo"* (Here is my head, here is my neck). Nogaret's design was to terrify the Pontiff, to drag from him an approval for the convening of the national council of France, at which he would be forced to appear. For three days the same acts of violence were repeated. This delay gave time to the Pope's friends, especially Cardinal Boccasini, to visit the city and the neighboring villages, spreading an account of the odious outrage. On Monday, September 9th, a sudden change took place among the populace. A crowd of people from Anagni and nearby rose up *en masse,* shouting: "Long live the Pope! Death to the traitors!" A mob ten thousand strong rushed toward the papal palace to demand the liberation of the Pontiff. There was a fight with the Colonna band, many of whom were slain. William of Nogaret was wounded and barely escaped. Boniface, thus freed, proceeded to Rome under the escort of Roman knights who had hastened to his assistance.

The contemporary narrative from which we have taken the above details ends with these words: "The Pope survived but a short time; he composed the sixth book of the Decretals and governed the Apostolic See in accordance with extreme rigor of the law for nine years and as many months. His life came to a close in 1303." [97] In a holy manner he breathed his last on October 11th, at the age of 86 years. His enemies, following him with their abuse even to the tomb, spread the rumor that he had died in a fit of madness, dashing his head against the wall, foaming at the mouth, and gnawing his hands. But the disinterment of his body in 1605 showed it to be perfectly intact; the calumnious rumors were thus nullified.[98] In defending the great work of Gregory VII and Innocent III by expressions that were sometimes too absolute and with a vivacity that was at times excessive, against the perfidious tactics of the legists, Boniface doubtless did not always exercise in the strife a sufficiently calm spirit nor take due account of the changes and temperaments required by the circumstances; but no fair mind can refuse to admire the loftiness of his ideal, the sincerity of his intentions, and, in short, the greatness of his pontificate.

---

[96] Boutaric, p. 117.

Benedict XI

That milder interpretation of the Bull *"Unam Sanctam,"* that adaptation of principles to the new conditions of modern society, which the disturbances of his latter days, as also a partial misunderstanding of events and a comprehensible attachment to the glorious past of the Middle Ages, did not permit Boniface to give, his successor, Benedict XI,[99] made to the King of France at the very outset of his pontificate. Philip IV sent a solemn embassy, made up of three members of his council and William of Nogaret, to "renew the former friendship" between the kingdom and the Holy See. Benedict refused to receive Nogaret, but issued a general pardon of all the excommunications incurred by other personages of France on occasion of the late conflicts.

---

[97] A contemporary account of the Anagni outrage was discovered by Baron Kervyn de Lettenhove in Reg. XIV, c. 1, of the British Museum, and published for the first time in the *Revue des Questions Historiques,* XI, p. 511 sqq.

[98] Christophe, p. 150.

[99] We do not know on what Michelet bases his statement that Benedict XI owed his elevation to intrigues of the Orsini. The new Pope received the papal insignia from the hands of the archdeacon, Cardinal Matteo Orsini. But a letter written by the new Pope states that he was elected by the unanimous vote of the Sacred College. (Raynaldi, IV, p. 360.)

The popes complement one another by their succession. To say with several historians that "Benedict, with general approval, disavowed all that Boniface had done," [100] is not sanctioned by better informed historians today.[101] That devoted friend of Boniface VIII, Nicholas Boccasini, whose noble soul was unshaken by the Anagni assassins, never disavowed the work of his predecessor. It may be that, in the light of events, he understood more clearly the uselessness of uncompromising resistance. In the words of a Catholic historian, "Boniface sought, in the interest of souls, to thwart and stifle a great error which was beginning; Benedict, likewise for the salvation of souls, sought to cure a great error which was triumphing." [102] In other words, Boniface VIII, the last pope of the Middle Ages, wished to defend to the utmost a social structure that was falling; Benedict XI, the first pope of modern times, did not wish abruptly to separate from the Church a new social structure that was rising. To fall in some other Anagni by the daggers of assassins hired by Nogaret and Colonna may indeed have seemed to him glorious, but useless. The Colonna had become masters of Rome; Florence was in flames; the quarrel between Guelfs and Ghibellines, formerly so bitter, had degenerated into contemptible encounters of petty passions and petty coteries. The Roman Court could not longer rely on the support of the empire. "If I abandon you," Philip had haughtily said to Boniface, "who will support you?" This insolent threat was more and more confirmed by subsequent events. Benedict resolved to do everything he could to bring about a much needed peace without sacrificing justice or truth.

---

[100] Boutaric, p. 122. In the same sense, Renan in *Histoire littéraire,* XXVII, p. 262, and Langlois in Lavisse, *Histoire de France,* III, part 2, p. 166.

[101] Funke, *Papst Benedikt XI,* proves that the two supposed letters to Philip the Fair (March 25th and April 2nd, 1304) were invented by the King himself.

[102] Gautier, *Benoit XI, étude sur la papauté au commencement du XIVe siècle,* p. 77.

On April 5th, 1304, he wrote to the King of France: "We are the disciple of Him who left us the parable of a man who made a great supper and said to his servants: 'Go out into the highways and hedges and compel them to come in that my house may be filled.'[103] And we have also regulated our conduct according to the parable of the Good Shepherd, who, after losing one of his hundred sheep, leaves the ninety-nine others and goes in search of the poor lost one, until he finds it, and then carries it back with joy on his shoulders. Will we not, then, bring you back to the house of God? Will we abandon a sheep such as you? Will we give ourselves any rest until we have carried you back on our shoulders to the fold of the Church? God forbid that any one should ever be able to reproach us with such neglect!"

The letter concludes thus: "With devotion and filial submission, accept this grace which we offer you, or rather which God offers, whose place we hold here below. Return to submission to Mother Church, a submission as honorable as it is salutary, and know that we have here below no keener desire than that of your salvation and the glory of your realm. Lastly consider, my son, that Joas, king of Juda, lived uprightly and gloriously only so long as he followed the counsels of the high priest Joad."[104]

On May 13th, 1304, the King of France was officially freed from the ban of excommunication. It is worth while showing

[103] Luke 14:23.

[104] Martène, *Veterum scriptorum amplissima collectio,* I, p. 1411.

in what lofty words the Pontiff notified the King of this decision. After formally stating that all who had coöperated in the outrage against Boniface VIII were guilty,[105] he added: "In the hope that the King of France and the French people will henceforth redouble their devotion to God and the Holy Roman Church, we free from ecclesiastical penalties all those on whom they were imposed by Boniface and our other predecessors, always excepting William of Nogaret, whose absolution we particularly reserve to the Holy See; and we receive them back today into the communion of the faithful and to the sacraments of the Church." [106]

To make this reconciliation more complete, Benedict XI renewed all the privileges which the popes had accorded to the crown of France. Twenty papal letters are devoted to these restitutions.[107] The clergy of the royal chapel he exempted from the jurisdiction of the bishop of Paris and the archbishop of Sens. He softened the decisions contained in the Bull *"Clericis laicos"* referring to contributions by the clergy and restricted the anathema to those who should exact the tax or lend direct aid to that exaction.[108] The French clergy, moreover, had taken part in public expenses without waiting for the papal decision. Says Boutaric: "The history of Philip's reign furnishes the most unquestionable proof of this; for it shows the French Church ruined by the part it had to take in contributing to the national revenues. Philip levied twenty-one ecclesiastical tithes, amounting to more than 400,000,000 francs." [109]

On June 7th, Benedict published a Bull of excommunication against Sciarra Colonna and Nogaret. Three weeks later, in words that recall the finest appeals of Peter the Hermit, Godfrey of Bouillon, and St. Bernard, he exhorted the Christian world to join the Crusade. This was one of the last acts of his pontificate.

---

[105] *"Se culpabiles reddiderunt in captione Bonifacii."*

[106] Raynaldi, IV, p. 377.

[107] Ptolémée de Lucques, *Hist. eccl.*, XXIV, cap. 38 sq., *apud* Muratori, vol. II.

[108] Raynaldi, IV, pp. 378 sqq.

[109] Boutaric, pp. 277, 278, 279; Gautier, *op. cit.*, p. 150.

Benedict XI died at Perugia, July 7th, 1304. The circumstances are thus reported by Villani: "While the Pontiff was at table, a young woman who said she was a servant of the Sisters of St. Petronilla, offered him in a silver dish a number of early figs of the finest appearance. Benedict, who was fond of this fruit, gladly accepted the gift and was unwilling to have a trial made of what was offered him by a woman. He ate them with relish and without suspicion, but at once was seized with violent pains." [110] The figs were poisoned,[111] and it was discovered that the pretended servant was a young man in woman's dress. Public veneration surrounded Benedict's tomb. Pope Urban VIII, after an examination into the immemorial cult rendered to this pontiff, proclaimed him Blessed (November 9th, 1638). Amidst one of the most disturbed periods, that in which Dante portrayed the terrible scenes of his Divina Commedia and the Pisans executed the lugubrious frescoes of their Campo Santo, he had tried to pacify Perugia, Venice, Padua, Lucca, Pistoia, and especially Florence, "that unfortunate city where one saw only mutual hatreds, threats, exile, imprisonment, and swords cruelly drawn in domestic strife." [112]

Rome itself did not offer the pope any greater safety. The Colonna and Orsini by their continual quarrels drenched the city in blood. According to the testimony of the chronicler

---

[110] Villani, *Storie fiorentine*, bk. 8, ch. 80; Potthast, no. 25448.

[111] A certain Ferreti of Vicenza, a contemporary, accused Philip the Fair of this crime. (Muratori, IX, p. 1013.) A monk of Westminster, writing fifty years later, makes Nogaret and Sciarra Colonna responsible for it (*Monach. Westmin., Flores histor.*, ann. 1364). Still later a certain Bernard Deliciosus was accused (Baluze, *Vitae paparum avenionensium*, II, no. 53). A recent biographer of Benedict XI rejects the hypothesis that the Pope was poisoned (Funke, *Papst Benedikt XI*). See also Hauréau, *Bernard Délicieux et l'inquisition albigeoise.*

[112] Benedict XI, *Epist.* 170.

Ferreti of Vicenza, an hour came when the exercise of papal authority became seriously endangered by the triumph of the Colonna.[113] On April 13th, 1304, Benedict, followed by the cardinals and an immense throng, determined to quit the Eternal City. He went to Perugia to await calmer days.[114] No pope was destined to appear again in Rome until October 13th, 1367, the day when Urban V made his solemn entry. Thus it was that the period began which the Romans called the second Babylonian Captivity.

During this new phase, we shall have occasion to note how the legists of Henry III in England and those of Louis of Bavaria in Germany continued the fatal work of the French legists. But beginning with the pontificate of Benedict's successor, we shall see a second class of workers appear, the heterodox doctors, destroyers of Christianity.

[113] *"Hic tutum se putans a gladiis impiorum, qui, Urbis tyrannidem exercentes, pastoralia decreta negligebant."* (Ferreti, *apud* Muratori, IX, pp. 1012, 1015.)

[114] This was not the first time that a pope left Rome because of disturbances in the city. From the time of Innocent IV, the popes resided there only intermittently.

CHAPTER III

1305–1315

During the period which we are about to treat, opposition to medieval institutions and to the supreme authority of the papacy is no longer carried on only by legists, such as Pierre Dubois and William of Nogaret, but is found among churchmen, such as William Occam, Marsilius of Padua, and John Wyclif. It bases its claims, not merely on Roman law, but on Gospel maxims and Christian tradition. When the England of Edward III, the Germany of Louis of Bavaria, and the Rome of Rienzi, after the France of Philip the Fair, endeavor to shake the temporal power of the Holy See, rebellious monks constitute themselves advisers and defenders of refractory princes and attempt to undermine the very foundations of the pope's spiritual authority. In the midst of such dangers, supreme pontiffs occupying the Holy See but residing in Avignon—Clement V, John XXII, Benedict XII, Clement VI, Innocent VI, Urban V, and Gregory XI—fettered by their financial embarrassments, softened by the luxury of a frivolous court, often the prisoners of cliques and factions, do not always rise to the height of their difficult task. However, the eminent holiness of Blessed Angela of Foligno, St. Gertrude, St. Elizabeth of Portugal, St. Juliana Falconieri, St. Andrew Corsini, Blessed John Colombini, and in Provence itself, near the popes, St. Elzear, Count of Sabran, and Blessed Delphine, his wife, St. Roseline and St. Roch bear witness to the inexhaustible vitality of Christian virtues in the bosom of the Catholic Church.

Clement V

The death of Benedict XI was followed by a long vacancy. For eleven months the powerful Colonna party, devoted to the interests of the French court, was at strife with the Italian party of the Orsini and Gaetani. On June 5th, 1305, the choice of the conclave fell upon one of French birth, although actually an English subject, an old and faithful friend of Boniface VIII, Bertrand de Got (or d'Agout), archbishop of Bordeaux, a man barely forty years of age. He was born in the village of Villandraut in Gascony and was related to the illustrious Périgord and Armagnac families. After a brilliant course in belles-lettres at Toulouse and in law at Orleans and Bologna,[1] he became successively canon of the church of Bordeaux, vicar-general of his brother Beraud, the archbishop of Lyons, then papal chaplain, bishop of Comminges, and archbishop of Bordeaux. Bertrand de Got was one of those bishops who, in 1302, in defiance of the King's prohibition, went to the council convened by the Pope. Soon after, when Philip the Fair called upon the French clergy to support him in his conflict with the head of the Church, the Archbishop of Bordeaux was again in the number of those who refused to subscribe. On that occasion he even had to exile himself from France and live for a while at the court of Pope Boniface VIII. Benedict XI's policy of pacification gave him a chance to return to favor with Philip the Fair, with whom he renewed the friendly relations he had had in his early youth.[2] Philip, who was his suzerain by virtue of the see of Bordeaux which he occupied,[3] very likely thought that Bertrand de Got was the only French prelate acceptable to the conclave, and accordingly supported his candidacy.[4] But the alleged interview between the King of France and the Archbishop of Bordeaux in the forest of Saint-Jean d'Angely, along with the mysterious and simoniacal agreement supposed to have been made there,[5] is purely legendary —suggested to the imagination of the Italians by their national resentment during the Avignon exile.[6]

---

[1] Baluze, I, pp. 615 sqq.

[2] "*Licet in anglia regione praesul esset, tamen Philippo gratissimus, eo quod a juventute familiaris extitisset.*" (Ferreti de Vicenza, bk. 9, p. 1014, *apud* Muratori, IX.)

[3] Bordeaux then belonged to England, but was a fief of the king of France.

Bertrand de Got received the news of his election while on a visitation of his province. He did not think that he, a Frenchman, could take up his residence at Rome, since Benedict XI, an Italian, had been obliged to keep away from the Eternal City.

It was in the city of Lyons, whither he had summoned the Roman Court, that he received the papal crown from the hands of Matteo Rosso dei Orsini, dean of the Sacred College, November 14th, 1305.[7] There were present also the King of France, the King of England, and all the great nobles of Italy. The metropolis of the Gauls witnessed the most solemn pomp of liturgical ceremonies. But the ever suspicious Italians regarded as an evil omen two regrettable incidents that happened in the midst of these magnificent festivities. On the coronation day, while the Pope, wearing the tiara, was returning on horseback to his residence and while the King of France, according to traditional usage, was leading the papal mount on foot, an old wall, overloaded with spectators, fell down just as the procession was passing; the Pope was upset, his crown fell off, and a stone of great price was loosened. Charles of Valois, a brother of the French King, was severely injured. Nine days later, at a dinner given the Pope on the occasion of his first papal mass, a quarrel broke out between his followers and those of the Italian cardinals and one of the Pope's brothers was killed. The Italians were downcast. The aged Cardinal Matteo Rosso dei Orsini, sadly shaking his head, said: "The French party has attained its aim. It has accomplished what it wanted. For a long time to come the Church will not return to Italy." [8]

---

[4] "There is no doubt that Philip viewed Clement V's election with pleasure," says Boutaric, "and that the majority of the Sacred College, in choosing him for pope, wished to please the King of France, is no less certain." (*Revue des questions historiques,* X, p. 309.) Boutaric's assertion rests on very significant avowals. Cf. a letter of Cardinal Napoleon des Ursins, Bibliothèque Nationale, no. 4991 (Baluze, II, pp. 289 sqq.).

[5] Villani, VIII, chap. 80. A French translation of Villani's account may be found in *Revue des questions historiques,* X, p. 304.

[6] The publication of Philip the Fair's *Mansiones et itinera* (*Historiens de la France,* XXI, pp. 443 sqq.) and that of the journal of the Archbishop of Bordeaux' visitations (Rabanis, *Clement V et Philippe le Bel*) prove, by authentic documents, the alibi of those two personages. Villani's dramatic account is, moreover, refuted by reports more reliable than his, as, for example, the account by Ferreti of Vicenza (Muratori, IX, p. 1012). That there was, nevertheless, some sort of understanding between Clement V and Philip IV, it would seem impossible to deny. On this point, see *Revue des questions historiques,* X, pp. 310 sq. Cf. Baluze, II, p. 62; Rabanis, *op. cit.,* p. 76.

[7] Villani, VIII, p. 81; Baluze, II, pp. 63, 624 sq.

Clement V at first led a wandering life, journeying from Lyons to Cluny, from Cluny to Nevers and Bourges, then, after being detained for a year at Bordeaux by sickness, successively to Toulouse, Narbonne, Montpellier, Nimes, and finally stopped at Avignon.

It was the spring of 1309. On the bank of the Rhone, the sunny attractiveness of which was apt to seduce the prelates from beyond the Alps by its seeming another Italy, equally charming and no less devoted to the cultivation of the fine arts, Clement at that time sought only a temporary asylum. He requested the modest hospitality of a Dominican monastery. It took more than half a century of calamities and the inspired appeals of a saint to rescue the papacy from the enchanting sojourn at Avignon.

Attempted Condemnation of Boniface VIII

Hemmed in by the Comtat Venaissin, which was part of the papal domain, Avignon, a city of the Provence countship, was a dangerous place of abode for the Holy See because of its nearness to the kingdom of France. The tower that Philip the Fair built soon afterwards on the opposite bank of the Rhone, facing the papal residence and, as it were, spying on it, still remains as a symbolic expression of the French kings' haughty watchfulness over the popes at Avignon.

---

[8] Villani, *loc. cit.*

Already the year before,[9] Philip the Fair, or rather the inner circle of his councillors, with Pierre Dubois as its soul and William of Nogaret the executor of its designs, had drawn the Pope to the city of Poitiers for a conference by which it was hoped to win him for the vast plans contemplated by the ambitious legists. In 1306, under the title, *De recuperatione terrae sanctae,* Pierre Dubois published the most important of his works,[10] which gives us the key to all the others and perhaps to the whole policy of Philip IV. To make the King of France the head of Christendom; to amass a great sum of money under pretext of a Crusade; to place in the King's hands the wealth of the religious Orders and of the secular clergy—this was the legist's dominant purpose. Having in view an expedition to the Holy Land, which seems to have been only a pretence, Dubois set forth a whole scheme of reforms calculated to strip the papacy and the clergy completely of their goods, which would be replaced by pensions paid by the French State.

It was well understood that this exaltation of the political power of the French king could not be realized without a corresponding lowering of the authority of the Holy See. That is why one of Philip's first cares was to bind the Pope by promises, to encompass him with French cardinals, and especially to destroy, if possible, the great doctrinal work and moral prestige of the pontificate of Boniface VIII.

---

[9] Most historians place the Poitiers conferences in 1307. But the *Mansiones et itinera* of Philip the Fair, as set forth by de Wailly in volume XXI of *Historiens de la France,* show that the King did not sojourn at Poitiers in 1307, whereas he was there two months and a half in 1308, from about May 15th to almost August 1st. (*Historiens de la France,* XXI, pp. 448, 450; cf. *Histoire littéraire,* XXVII, p. 308.)

[10] Bongars first republished this work anonymously in his collection entitled *Gesta Dei per Francos.* Boutaric has proved that it is certainly the work of Pierre Dubois.

This now becomes the goal of the King's every effort and that of his advisers at the conferences at Poitiers. They ask that all the acts of Boniface, from All Saints 1300, be annulled, that he be declared a heretic, that his bones be disinterred and publicly burned. When submitting to the Pope forty-three heretical propositions attributed to Boniface VIII, the king's council added, indeed, that its earnest desire was to see the late Pope's innocence established and proclaimed.[11] The legist Guillaume de Plaisians, whom we have already met at the side of Nogaret, begged besides for the canonization of Pope Celestine, Boniface's predecessor. Clement V easily saw through the hypocrisy of these petitions; but he was not of a stature to withstand the assault of so many conspiring passions and hatreds. It would have required a Gregory VII or an Innocent III.

The Pope sought to gain time, consulted his cardinals,[12] and finally (June 1st, 1308) [13] published the Bull *"Laetamur in te,"* in which he tried to evade the King's request in the matter of Boniface and exhorted Philip, in the name of peace and union, to desist from his accusations and leave the examination of the question to the Church. On the other hand, to show his good will towards the King, he revoked and annulled all the sentences of excommunication or interdict or any other penalties pronounced against the King of France, his kingdom, and all his associates, abettors, or adherents. As for

---

[11] Raynaldi, 1307, no. 10. Dupuy, *op. cit.*, pp. 31 sq.; *Preuves*, pp. 286, 298, 376, 379; Baluze, I, col. 30; Tosti, pp. 424 sqq.; Fleury, *Histoire ecclésiastique*, bk. 91, no. 13; *Histoire littéraire*, XXVII, p. 306.

[12] Villani, VIII, chap. 91; Fleury, *loc. cit.*

[13] We have seen above that this Bull is probably dated incorrectly. It bears the date 1307, but it seems that it should be placed in 1308.

Nogaret, whose case, ever since the Anagni outrage, had always been considered as one apart, he was enjoined, by way of expiation for his crime, to place himself at the head of a crusade after the lapse of three years.[14]

Philip's councillors, dissatisfied with the conference at Poitiers, treated this Bull as a dead letter.[15] By means of chicanery and artifices, Nogaret succeeded in having it admitted that the Bull decided nothing fundamentally and that the matter of Boniface's trial remained intact. This question of Boniface's trial has been justly compared to a sword of Damocles which Philip's legists kept suspended over Clement's head in the hope of forcing him to yield to their scheme. So long as the work and person of the author of the Bull *"Unam sanctam"* were not discredited in public opinion and in the Church itself, it seemed to them that nothing was accomplished.

In the face of renewed insistance, Clement finally promised to open the case against Boniface and declared that, despite his faith in his predecessor's innocence, he would agree to hear the Pontiff's accusers in compliance with the desire of the King of France.

The trial began March 16th, 1310, at Avignon, where the Pope had just established his residence. It was prolonged until February, 1311, amidst painful incidents and violent agitation. The Colonna and Nogaret followers, with unprecedented audacity, brought forward the most infamous charges against the late Pope: heresy, treason, debauchery, all the lying rumors that hatred had maliciously spread abroad for ten years past.[16] Devoted partisans of the Pontiff, among others two of his nephews, replied forcibly and were not always able to restrain their anger.[17] The strategy of Pope Clement, who was greatly embarrassed by the affair, the introduction of which had been wrung from his weakness, was to have the trial drag along. Preliminary questions and dilatory incidents succeeded one another. At length, in the month of February, 1311, a letter from Philip IV suddenly halted the proceedings. Considering the gravity of the issues and the fact that Pope Clement V was so occupied with the cares imposed on him by the question of the Holy Land, the reëstablishment of peace between France and England, and the trial of the Templars, the King announced that he withdrew from the trial against Boniface VIII, which he knew was painful to the reigning Pontiff, and that he would turn the affair over to a council soon to be held for a happy termination, for the glory of God and the Church. He also intended that the Templars' case should be referred to this same council.[18]

---

[14] Baluze, I, col. 30; Raynaldi, 1307, no. 10; Baillet, *Preuves*, pp. 46–51.

[15] This explains why Dupuy did not find it in the Archives of the Crown. But the document is in the Vatican.

[16] Hefele, IX, pp. 326–338.

Clement, suddenly freed from the harassing alarms in the midst of which he had been living for a year past, was not moderate enough in testifying to his joy and gratefulness. Not satisfied with congratulating the French King on his happy decision to withdraw from the prosecution of the dead Pope, he declared that Philip and his friends had been actuated by a praiseworthy zeal and had done everything in this affair in good faith.[19] In the Bull *"Rex gloriae"* (April 17th, 1311) he repeated that throughout the campaign which the King and his councillors had conducted against Boniface VIII, their intentions had been good and pure. He excepted only the Anagni outrage, which was credited to Nogaret and a few others. Consequently all the documents bearing sentence of condemnation against the King and his friends must be destroyed in the books of the Roman Church and by any possessors thereof within four months, under pain of excommunication.[20]

---

[17] Accusers of Boniface VIII pretended that, not far from Avignon, their adversaries had prepared an ambush for them. (See Dupuy, pp. 288 sqq.)

[18] Dupuy, pp. 296 sqq.; Hefele, IX, pp. 339 sq.

[19] Letter of Philip, in Dupuy, pp. 296, 592 sq.

This was to fall completely into the trap laid by the legists. Philip's real motive in interrupting the procedure against Boniface was the better to consecrate all his powers to the pursuit of the Order of Templars, whose wealth he coveted, and to drag the Pope into this lengthy trial which had such heavy responsibilities in store for Clement.

The Knights Templars

In the terrible tragedy that was ended by the execution of the Grand Master of the Temple in the Place du Parvis de Notre Dame in Paris, the most recent and impartial studies are more and more favorable to the victims and more and more condemnatory of the King of France.

The illustrious Order which, at first in concert with, then as a rival of, the Knights of St. John of Jerusalem, had been the last bulwark of Christendom against the infidels of the East, was at this time at the zenith of its greatness. It possessed immense riches. Artisans, wealthy merchants, and rich land-owners deposited their savings in its impregnable castles. Thus the Templars had become the chief bankers of Europe. Popes and kings, including Philip the Fair himself, had recourse to them in pressing needs.[21] Peasants, workmen, and tradesmen, in order to escape the pursuit and exactions of the nobles and even of royal agents, became "Templars' men," signed agreements in which they engaged, "for profit and usefulness and in order to avoid future perils," [22] to pay the Temple a few farthings' rent in token of dependence. The Templars, bound by vows of religion, practically depended only on their own chief and, almost exempted from papal jurisdiction, constituted a well-nigh autonomous social power in Europe, which might become a great danger. The power of money, the prestige of the sword, and respect for the cross united to give them a unique dominance. "The pride of a Templar" became a by-word.

---

[20] Raynaldi, 1311, cap. 26, 32; Dupuy, pp. 592–601; Hefele, IX, pp. 345–348. We cannot understand why Hefele writes that the Bull *"Rex gloriae"* "begins with principles quite opposed to those of Boniface VIII." Clement merely says, with untimely emphasis, that earthly kingdoms were created by God and that, in the new covenant, France enjoys nearly the same place as was formerly occupied by the people of Israel.

[21] Toward the middle of 1306, during an uprising at Paris, caused by an alteration of the currency, King Philip found no safer refuge than the Temple, and thither he betook himself. (Dupuy, *Preuves,* p. 288.)

In the early part of the fourteenth century, previous to Clement V's election, it is related that a Templar, confined in a royal prison for his crimes, made some strange revelations to his fellow-prisoners as to serious disorders existing in the Temple and that had, until then, been surrounded by the greatest secrecy. Later events showed that the accounts were not without some foundation. When these rumors reached the King, he consulted the new Pope about them.[23] It may be that the mysterious engagements mentioned above, between Clement V and Philip the Fair,[24] were concerned precisely with measures to be taken against the powerful Order of Templars.

To thwart the insolence of so menacing a power may have been a political necessity for the French King; to suppress grave abuses among the religious of the Temple by disciplinary measures and, if need be, even by suppressing the Order, was perhaps required for the good of the Church. An understanding to this effect between the Pope and the King contained nothing that was not quite legitimate. But Philip's cupidity was bound to give both the prosecution of the Templars and their suppression an odious character of cruelty and revenge.

---

[22] *"Pro commodo et utilitate, et ad vitanda futura pericula."* Boutaric, p. 127.

[23] According to a contemporary chronicler, the continuer of William of Nangis, the question of the Templars was discussed at the Poitiers meetings. *"Deliberatum fuit super pluribus . . . ac praesertim de Templariorum captione." Chronique de Guillaume de Gangis*, Edition of the Société de l'histoire de France, I, p. 359.

[24] See page 50, note 6.

This grave question had already attracted the attention of King St. Louis, Gregory IX, Nicholas IV, and Boniface VIII, and an attempt had been made to solve it by fusing the Order of the Temple with that of the Knights or Hospitallers of St. John of Jerusalem. The aim of the two institutions was the same, and it was hoped "to temper the pride of the Temple by the well-known gentleness of the Hospitallers of St. John." [25] But the Templars' invariable opposition was an insurmountable obstacle. In 1307 Jacques de Molay, Grand Master of the Temple, fearing lest the Pope would take up St. Louis' idea, addressed a memorial to him, setting forth the dangers of a merger of the two Orders. "That," he said, "would be to face grave perils: the Templars and the Hospitallers have arms." [26] These words were evidently a thinly veiled threat.

Clement V, after conferring with Philip, was ready to begin a regular inquiry, when he learned that all the Templars of France had by the King's order been arrested at the same hour on the morning of October 13th, 1307. Even though we lacked documentary evidence on the subject, we might easily have suspected Nogaret's hand in this stroke of force. There is a paper preserved in the crown treasury that confirms this surmise. At a council meeting, held September 23rd, at the royal abbey of Maubuisson, Nogaret was entrusted with this business.[27]

---

[25] Boutaric in *Revue des questions historiques*, XI, p. 17.

[26] *"Possent multæ pericula provenire quia Templarii et Hospitaliarii habent arma."*—Baluze is mistaken in dating this memoir, 1311. Boutaric is more probably right in placing it in 1307. (*Revue des questions historiques, loc. cit.*)

[27] *"Anno Domini CCCVII, die veneris, post festum B. Mathie apostoli, Rege existente in monasterio regali B. Mariae juxta Pontisaram, traditum fuit sigillum domino G. de Nogareto, militi, ubi tunc tractatum fuit de captione Templariorum."* (Reg. XLIV of the *Trésor des Chartes*, fol. 3. Archives Nationales, J. J. 44.)

The circular which accompanied the order of arrest and which was read to the people, made it appear that the Pope was a party to the royal measure. It contained this ambiguous phrase: "After consulting[28] our most holy father in God, Clement, and after deliberating with our prelates and barons, . . . we empower and direct you, by strict order, to proceed to . . . and there place under arrest all the brethren without exception, to hold them prisoners for presentation to the judgment of the Church, and to seize their goods, both movable and immovable."[29]

Pope Clement indignantly protested. "In contempt of every rule," he wrote to Philip, "while we were far from you, you have stretched forth your hand to the persons and goods of the Templars and have even gone so far as to put them in prison. . . . We cannot doubt that, today rather than tomorrow, as soon as our envoys reach you, ready to receive the persons and goods of the Order of the Temple, you will hasten to turn them over as safely, promptly, and honorably as it can be done."[30]

The accomplished jurists who were Philip's advisers had thought to find a means of assuring the legality of these arbitrary arrests and confiscations. The Church alone, as was well known, had the right to bring a religious Order to trial. But the procedure of the Inquisition seemed to the enemies of the Temple to offer a legal means of attaining their purpose. Philip's confessor, William of Paris,[31] by his position as Inquisitor General of the kingdom, had the right to require from the King the intervention of the secular arm for the purpose of prosecuting, not a whole Order, but any individual member. This is what they obtained from him, thinking thus to shelter themselves behind the form of strict legality.

---

[28] This word insinuated that the Pope's approbation had been obtained. But nothing could be falser.

[29] Published by Boutaric, after the original which is preserved in the *Trésor des Chartes,* J. 413, no. 22.

[30] This letter, dated October 27th, 1307, was omitted by Blauze. Boutaric published it for the first time, after the original text, which is preserved in the *Trésor des Chartes,* J. 416, no. 2.

[31] On William of Paris, see Lajard's study in *Histoire littéraire,* XXVII, pp. 140–152.

But the Pope judged otherwise. He pronounced as unworthy those inquisitors who lent themselves to this odious measure, suspended the powers of the Inquisition in France, and summoned the case before his own tribunal.

Philip, seeing his plan foiled, feigned to submit, promised to surrender the persons of the Templars to the Pope's representatives, and to have their goods sequestrated. But while the Pope was felicitating him on his good will,[32] the royal legists did not remain idle. Pierre Dubois, whose pen outlined the revolutionary schemes that were carried out by Nogaret's sword, wrote a lengthy memoir to all the princes of Europe, in which, under cover of a great crusading project, he suggested a plan for completely destroying the Order of the Temple and secularizing its goods by means of Inquisition proceedings, to which all powers would be entrusted.[33]

A *Petition of the People of France,* very much like the *Entreaty of the People of France against Boniface VIII,* likewise came from the pen of Pierre Dubois, who issued numerous pamphlets, attacked the Pope, accused him of avarice, nepotism, extortion, and all sort of crimes, and went so far as to declare him devoid of any rights. "Whoever does what he ought is the son of God," he said. "Whoever does otherwise through fear, love, or hatred, is the son of the devil and denies God by that very fact." This was nothing less than Wyclif's theory. Dubois said further: "The path for us to follow was taught us by Moses on the occasion of Israel's apostasy before the golden calf: '*Let every one take his sword and*

---

[32] Baluze, II, p. 113.

[33] Boutaric in *Revue des questions historiques,* X, pp. 337 sq.

slay his nearest neighbor' . . . Why should not the King, the most Christian prince, proceed in the same way, even against all the clergy if the clergy (which God forbid!) should err or maintain errors?" This was nothing less than the doctrine of Henry VIII, Elizabeth, and Cromwell.[34] In the presence of these violent attacks, the Pope remained silent. The inquisitors, however, gathered a large number of confessions from the lips of the arrested Templars. The indictments by the courts of Paris, Champagne, Normandy, Querci, Bigorre, and Languedoc have been preserved. At Paris the accused appeared in a hall of their fortress before some of the King's councillors and some monks delegated by William of Paris. The records make no mention of torture; but the later statements of the accused lead us to believe that it was not omitted and, moreover, that it was atrocious.[35] Jacques de Saci declared that he saw twenty-five of the brethren die, following their interrogation. Out of 138, about 130 confessed to having taken part in abominable crimes. Jacques de Molay, the Grand Master, acknowledged that he had denied Christ and had spit upon the cross, while others declared they had taken part in obscene debaucheries. Most of them later retracted these confessions.

But it was necessary to convince the Pope of the Templars' guilt. From the chief culprits Philip selected seventy-two knights. Were they ashamed or afraid to retract after so short an interval the confessions wrung from them by torture? Were they really guilty? The fact is that at Chinon, in the presence of three cardinals, with perfect freedom, if we are to believe the official report, without threat or compulsion, after swearing to tell the truth, they declared themselves guilty of the crimes imputed to them.[36] When the Pope became acquainted with the official report of these confessions, and when at Avignon itself, in full consistory, he heard a man of great influence and kindliness [37] confirm them by his word, he became convinced. With a haste which may be considered excessive, but which is sufficiently explained by the pathetic surprises of this dark affair, he withdrew the suspension of the French bishops and gave orders that they should proceed without delay to investigate the charges against the Templars.

---

[34] *Histoire littéraire,* XXVII, pp. 524–527; Boutaric, *Notices et extraits des manuscrits,* published by the Institute, XX, part 2, pp. 175 sq., 182 sq.; *Revue des questions historiques,* X, p. 340.

[35] See the documents cited by Lea, *History of the Inquisition of the Middle Ages,* bk. 3, chap. 5, especially pp. 317 sqq. and Vacandard, *The Inquisition,* p. 189.

Then began, not only in France, but also outside that kingdom, those investigations which, as has been said, turned Europe into a vast court of inquiry.[38] Clement at last formally authorized the use of torture.[39] Vacandard says: "the tribunals of the Inquisition were perhaps never more cruel than in the case of the Templars." [40]

---

[36] *Praestito juramento . . . libere ac sponte, absque coactione qualibet et terrore coram ipsis tribus cardinalibus . . . deposuerunt."* Bull, *"Ad omnium fere notitiam,"* in Dupuy, p. 278. In an address to the Académie des Inscriptions et Belles Lettres, on May 28th and June 4th, 1909, Paul Viollet maintained that the attestations in the official report of the interrogatory at Chinon cannot be accepted as witnessing to the truth of the matter. Cardinal Bérenger de Fiédol, with the good intention of saving the innocent Templars, is supposed to have introduced into the report the avowals of the accused religious, among others that of Jacques de Molay. The King had indeed said that the knights who would not confess should be executed. Cf. Noël Valois, *Deux nouveaux témoignages sur le procès des Templiers,* Reports of the Académie des Inscriptions, 1910, pp. 229–241; Lizerand, *Clément V et Philippe le Bel;* Carrière, *Faits nouveaux en faveur des Templiers,* in the *Revue de l'histoire de l'Eglise de France,* Jan.–Feb. 1912, pp. 55–71. In his study on the *Dépositions de Jacques Molay,* published in the *Moyen Age,* March–April, 1913, Lizerand rejects the hypothesis advanced by Viollet and concludes that de Molay was far from being a hero.

[37] *"Magnae auctoritatis ac generositatis virum."*

[38] Christophe, I, p. 255.

[39] Raynaldi, 1311, no. 53. The introduction of torture into the inquisitorial proceedings was due to Innocent IV in the middle of the thirteenth century. It is known that Pope St. Nicholas I blamed the use of violent measures towards the accused (*Responsa ad Bulgaros,* cap. 86) and that the *Decretum* of Gratian forbade the extortion of confession by torture (Causa XV, quest. XV, cap. 1). But the legists, everywhere reviving the traditions of antiquity, began to have recourse to torture as a speedy method of obtaining information. "The earliest instances with which I have met," says Lea, "occur in the Veronese Code of 1228 and the Sicilian Constitutions of Frederick II in 1231." Lea, *op. cit.,* I, p. 421; cf. Vacandard, pp. 147 sq.

At Paris a provincial synod, held by Philip de Marigny, archbishop of Sens, under the King's favor, condemned as relapsed forty-five Templars, who were given over to the secular arm and burned alive (May 12th, 1310).[41] Terror took possession of the prisoners. "Yesterday," says Knight Aymeri de Villiers-le-Duc, "I saw my brethren in carts going to the execution pile. I feel that I would have avowed anything. I would have confessed that I had killed God, if they wanted me to make such an avowal." The same scenes were witnessed at Senlis. In Provence, where the Templars had been confined in the castles of Meyrargues and Pertuis, the court that was to try them was composed only of their avowed enemies.[42] An upright man, Guillaume Agardi (or d'Agard), provost of Saint-Sauveur, declined the duties of commissioner in so prejudiced a trial. It is related that Charles of Valois, Philip the Fair's brother, had some Templars of Provence burned; local traditions, on the contrary, affirm that Robert the Good, who was governing Provence, let them live.[43]

The King of France invited all the rulers of the West to imitate his conduct toward the Templars. Edward II of England, after answering in the negative, decided (January 7th, 1308) to imprison all those found in England, Ireland, and Wales. Very few confessed themselves guilty, and we may suppose that torture, fear, or promises wrung these confessions from them.[44] At the request of Ferdinand IV, king of Castile and Leon, the Pope (July 31st, 1308) established in Spain a papal commission that was instructed to begin the interrogation of the accused. But they could not be convicted of any crime.[45] In Aragon the Templars, whom James II summoned to appear, withdrew to their citadels and held out against long sieges by the royal troops. They finally declared their willingness to surrender to the Pope, but not to the King, since their castles, they said, were the property of the Church and not of the King. Notwithstanding severe imprisonment and cruel tortures, they never confessed any crime. In the Island of Cyprus, the Knights of the Temple also tried to defend themselves in their fortified monasteries.[46] In Portugal they took to flight. In Italy and Germany the proceedings against them and the treatment they received were of various sorts. But everywhere they were tracked, imprisoned, and tortured.

---

[40] Vacandard, p. 188.

[41] Hefele, IX, p. 356, following Havemann, *Geschichte des Ausgangs des Tempelherrenordens.*

[42] Bouche, *Essai sur l'histoire de Provence,* I, p. 348.

[43] *Ibid.,* p. 349.

[44] Hefele, IX, pp. 356 sqq.

The Council of Vienne

The Pope, however, reserved to himself the judgment of the Order as a whole and also the proceedings against its higher dignitaries. By the Bull *"Alma Mater"* [47] (April 4th, 1310), he appointed October 1st, 1311, for the meeting of a general council at Vienne for the purpose of reaching a decision on the three following matters: the question of the Templars, the help to be secured for the Holy Land, and the reform of the clergy. A large number of bishops assembled there from France, Italy, Spain, Germany, England, Scotland, and Ireland.[48]

From the beginning, the great question that seemed to dominate and almost absorb all the others was that of abolishing the Order of Templars. Clement's predicament was critical. On the one hand, Philip the Fair, who had come to Lyons to watch the council at close range, was imperiously demanding the immediate suppression of the Order. On the other hand, the great majority of the fathers of the council declared it impossible to suppress the Temple judicially without hearing the Knights in their own defense. Meanwhile, the awkward situation was made still more embarrassing by the unexpected arrival of nine Knights of the Temple, who declared their readiness to defend the Order against every accusation. At the same time there was talk of 1500 or 2000 Templars roaming in the Lyonnais mountains and prepared, in their turn, to come to Vienne to defend themselves. The Pope was disturbed and alarmed. He wrote to Philip, forewarning him of the danger.[49] Some time later the French King arrived at Vienne with so imposing an escort that it was more like an army. The decree abolishing the Order of Templars was already prepared. In conformity with the almost unanimous opinion of the fathers, the Pope declined to pronounce a judicial condemnation, as the Templars had not been heard in their own defense; but, by way of administrative decree,[50] he declared the Order abolished. This was, in fact, the purport of a decision made by the Pope (March 22nd, 1312) in secret consistory. On April 3rd, in a public consistory at which Philip the Fair was present, the Pontiff promulgated, in the presence of an immense throng, the Bull *"Ad providam,"* which decreed the dissolution of the Order of Templars and disposed of their possessions in favor of the Hospitallers of St. John of Jerusalem, in order that these possessions, having originally been given for the interests of the Holy Land, might not be alienated from their purpose.[51]

---

[45] Benavides, *Memorias de D. Fernando IV de Castilla,* I, pp. 629–634, cited by Hefele, IX, p. 358.

[46] Hefele, IX, pp. 359 sq.

[47] Hardouin, VII, p. 1334.

[48] Baluze, I, p. 43. It is not certain how many prelates were present. Villani speaks of 300 bishops (bk. 9, p. 22, *apud* Muratori, XIII, p. 454), but William of Nangis speaks of only 114 (d'Achery, *Spicilegium,* III, p. 65).

---

[49] Clement's letter to Philip is published by Christophe, I, pp. 430 sq.

[50] *"Per modum provisionis seu ordinationis apostolicae, non autem de jure nec per modum definitivae sententiae."*

Through the ill-will of the legists, this purpose of the Pope could not be attained. The King not only failed to give up the considerable monies which he had seized in the banks of the Temple, but, alleging old accounts which had not been settled, declared himself a creditor of the Order for considerable sums of which, however, he was unable to specify the amount. The Hospitallers had to consent to a transaction by virtue of which they paid the King 200,000 French livres on March 21st, 1313. Even this sacrifice did not free them from all claims. They had also to indemnify the crown for whatever sum it considered that it had spent for the support of the imprisoned Templars, as also for the expenses of jail and torture. "In short," writes Langlois, "it seems proved that the Hospitallers were impoverished rather than enriched by the gift to their Order." [52]

There still remained the finishing of the trial of Jacques de Molay, the Grand Master, and some chief dignitaries of the Order, whose case the Pope had reserved to himself. This was the last act of the tragedy. The Council of Vienne had decided that mildness was to be shown to the accused and that severity should be exercised only against the obstinate and the relapsed. Once again Philip's perfidy and the regrettable inaction of the weak and infirm Pope rendered these prescriptions vain.

The papal commission appointed to conduct the trial was found to be made up of cardinals and bishops devoted to the King and determined to act with the utmost rigor. Following an abusive practice already employed, it was decided that, whoever should disavow his confession, was to be regarded as relapsed and sentenced to be burned alive. As the chief dignitaries accused had already acknowledged their guilt, all chance of saving themselves seemed lost. Should they maintain their first declaration, their penalty would be life imprisonment; if they retracted, it meant death at the stake. They had been kept in prison for seven years. In despair they determined not to return there again. Let us hear the most trustworthy chronicler of this period, the continuator of Guillaume de Nangis: "As the Grand Master of the Temple and his three companions, the 'visitors' of France, Aquitania, and Normandy, had publicly acknowledged the crimes imputed to them and had persisted in their avowals,[53] finally after mature deliberation, the cardinals, seeing that their perseverance did not falter, had them led to the Place du Parvis de Notre Dame in Paris, there to announce to them their condemnation 'au mur' and life imprisonment. It was the Monday following the feast of St. Gregory (March 12th, 1314).[54] But just when the cardinals thought all was finished, of a sudden and contrary to all expectation,[55] the Grand Master of the Temple and the Master of Normandy, turning firmly and not without a certain irreverence toward the cardinal who had just concluded the reading, and toward the Archbishop of Soissons, declared that they retracted their confessions and all avowals previously made. There was general astonishment. The cardinals remanded the acused to the custody of the provost of Paris, who was present, to hold them until a further consideration of the matter, which was expected to be held the following day. But the report was not slow in reaching the King in his palace. Philip consulted his advisers, without, however, calling in his clergy, and after mature reflection, late that afternoon, had the two relapsing Templars consigned to the flames on a little island in the Seine, between the royal gardens and the Augustinian church.[56] The condemned men faced the flames with such firmness and met death with such fortitude and contempt for life that the crowd looking on was struck with amazement and admiration. The two accused who had not retracted underwent confinement in the prison assigned to them.[57]

---

[51] Mansi, XXV, pp. 389 sq. Hefele (IX, pp. 411–417) gives detailed information on the various Bulls issued by Clement V regarding the abolition of the Order of the Temple.

[52] Langlois in Lavisse, *Histoire de France,* III, part 2, p. 198.

---

[53] *"Cum praedicti quatuor nullo excepto crimina sibi imposita palam et publice confessi fuissent et in hujus confessione persisterent."* (*Historiens de la France,* XX, p. 609.)

[54] The chronicler says 1313. But we know that at that time in France the year began with Easter, while at Rome it began at Christmas.

[55] *"Dum cardinales finem negotio imposuisse credidissent, confestim et ex insperato . . . non absque multorum admiratione. . . ."* (*Historiens de la France* XX, p. 609.)

Was that fearlessness in the face of death the sign of a clear conscience? Or was it only a desperate move of two souls weary of all the suffering and injustice which a hateful procedure had made them undergo, and ready to escape therefrom by precipitating themselves into certain death? History will perhaps never solve this problem.[58]

The Empire in Italy

When the news of the terrible execution reached the Pope, who had retired to the papal residence at Monteaux near Carpentras, he was already afflicted with the ailment which soon after led to his death. He was overwhelmed by cares of all sorts to his very last days.

In Italy and Germany the Guelfs and Ghibellines continued their strife without relaxation and with an ever increasing intensity. On March 14th, 1314, three days after Jacques de Molay's execution, the course of events induced Clement V to exercise upon Germany an act of authority of which only one example was known up to that time:[59] it was to appoint, by his own authority, an imperial vicar for Italy, empowered with the provisional administration of the Italian provinces of the Empire in the name of the Pope. The new ruler was the head of the Guelph party, Robert of Anjou. To appreciate the import of this measure, we must go back a few years. When Emperor Albert of Austria was assassinated (May 1st, 1308) by his nephew John of Swabia, the legists of Philip the Fair boldly turned their ambitious gaze on the vacant Empire. Pierre Dubois wrote: "Philip will establish in France the meaning of European polity. He will pacify Germany and Italy and will then be able to lead the united West to the conquest of the Saviour's sepulchre." The King of France tried to have his own brother, Charles of Valois, elected emperor, and for this purpose even solicited the support of Clement V, who made vague promises.[60] The Pontiff, on the contrary, looked with favor upon the election of Henry of Luxemburg, a lesser lord of a county of the Ardennes forest, who took the name of Henry VII and at first seemed to second the Pope's views with zeal. Clement had him crowned emperor at Rome by papal legates (June 22nd, 1313).[61] But visions of universal dominion, evoked by long sojourns in France and Rome, haunted the mind of the new Emperor. From the day when, urged by his ambition, Henry placed Robert of Anjou, the Guelf leader, under the ban of the Empire on the ground of the vassalage of his countship of Provence and because of the sovereign rights of the imperial majesty, from the day especially when he was seen at Rome supporting the Ghibelline party, which had always represented the terrible Colonna family, the Pope could not help but protest. Henry VII died (August 24th, 1313) as he was preparing an expedition into

---

[56] Opposite the present *quai des Augustins.*

[57] Chronicle of William of Nangis, *Historiens de la France, loc. cit.*

[58] *Ibid.,* XX, p. 691. "This year," says the *Chroniques de Saint-Denis,* "in the month of March, during Lent, the Master General of the Temple and another grand master who was after him in the Order, the so-called visitor, on the island at Paris in front of the Augustinian church, were burned and the bones of both were reduced to ashes; after that no one bothered to refer to them."

---

[59] In 1268 the Holy See had named King Charles I vicar of the Empire.

[60] Lavisse and Rambaud, *Histoire générale,* III, pp. 225, 614.

[61] Raynaldi, 1311, nos. 6 sq.

Apulia in the face of the papal excommunication just published against anyone who should attack the kingdom of Naples, a fief of the Roman Church.

Philip the Fair, ever zealous in supporting the rights of the Pope when he judged them useful to his own plans, encouraged Clement to maintain the prerogatives of the papacy against imperial claims. It was in this spirit that the Pontiff published two decretals, subsequently inserted into the Clementines, wherein he condemned Henry's claims and refuted the arguments of his lawyers.[62] In the midst of the ceaseless struggles waged by the multitude of quarreling petty rulers in Italy, the Pope, with the intent of maintaining papal prerogatives, appointed a pontifical vicar to administer the territories of the Empire in Italy.[63] But if, in one sense, the Empire was dead under the form of its ancient organization, the Ghibelline spirit of national autonomy and opposition to the papacy was more alive than ever. Dante became its eloquent spokesman, not only in his *Divina Commedia,*[64] but also and especially in his famous treatise *De Monarchia.*[65] And the acts of defiance for papal authority which were provoked everywhere, but principally in Italian speaking countries, by the learned theories and fiery verses of the great Florentine poet, were not the least of the causes of the sadness that overshadowed the Pontiff's last months in his solitary castle at Monteaux.

---

[62] Constit. II, *"Pastoralis,"* II, XI, *de Sent. et R. judic.;* Constit. un. *"Romani principes,"* II, IX.

[63] Raynaldi, 1314, no. 2; Baluze, I, p. 53.

[64] *Purgatorio,* VI, 88 sqq., VIII, 124 sqq.; *Paradiso,* XVIII, 115 sqq., XXVII, 139 sqq.

[65] Dante therein maintained: 1. that a universal monarchy is necessary for the earthly well-being of humanity; 2. that God confided its government directly to the Roman emperor; 3. that the pope, in so far as he is a prince, is subordinate to the emperor. Dante, however, was attacking, not so much the temporal sovereignty of the popes as its very great extension and the obstacles raised by the Guelph party against the monarchy. His arguments in support of his thesis are curious indeed. In every multitude that has a common end, he says, there must be a single chief. The best state for the world is that which most closely resembles God: but He is one. The ruler of the entire world has nothing to desire, hence he no longer has any passions and with him good will encounters no obstacles. The monarch is not for himself, but for others. Hence it follows that under a monarchy the people are very free. Moreover, whatever can be done by a single individual is always better done by one than by many. Lastly, has not God, by His authority, sanctioned the excellence of universal monarchy? It was while Augustus was making unity and peace reign in the world that the Word willed to become incarnate, and that was the moment which St. Paul called the fullness of time.

His relations with England were also beset with difficulties. At a national synod, held about the feast of the Ascension 1312, King Edward II protested against the Pope's claim that he had a right to tax the clergy for some pious undertaking. Undoubtedly there was question of a crusade. The abbot of St. Edmund even appealed to the Pope to this effect.[66] At this same period, on occasion of a revolt of the nobility, we see Clement V send two legates to England to bring about peace. But in Edward's protest against a money contribution we can perceive a murmur that forbodes the solemn refusal which Edward III soon afterwards made to a like demand of the papacy.

Heresies

Pope Clement V derived great consolation in 1312 from the promulgation of the Acts of the Council of Vienne and from the orderly collection of his constitutions which he presented to the Sacred College at a consistory held March 21st, 1314, four weeks before his death. The Decrees of the Council of Vienne and the *Clementinæ* are the two imperishable monuments of his pontificate.[67]

The examination of the Templars' case was not, as we have seen above, the sole object of the Council of Vienne; it was also to treat the question of reforming the Church.

---

[66] Mansi, XXV, pp. 517–520.

[67] On the date of the Decrees of the Council of Vienne, see Hefele, IX, p. 419. The *Clementines,* a methodical collection of the constitutions of Clement V, were published by his successor, John XXII, in 1317. See John XXII's *Proœmium* at the beginning of the *Clementines* in the *Corpus juris canonici* (Richter ed., II, p. 1056; Boehmer ed., II, p. 1041). On Damberger's objections to the ecumenicity of the Council of Vienne, see Hefele-Leclercq, *Histoire des conciles,* I, p. 88.

The investigation incident to the trial of the Templars revealed three chief sources of abuses in the Church, namely, the too absolute exemption of certain religious Orders from episcopal control, the worldly life of the clergy, and, as a consequence of these two causes, an infiltration of suspected doctrines into the Church.

"It is evident," said the Archbishop of Bourges, "that the religious of the Temple would not have given themselves up to the impiety and corruption of which they are accused, if they had been under a stricter control of the episcopate."[68] The fathers of the council seemed for a while inclined to abolish all exemptions. But after reflection, they confined themselves to the suppression of certain abuses, whether of exempt religious or of prelates.[69]

William Durandus, bishop of Mende,[70] in a remarkable memoir in which he called for the reform of the Church *in capite et in membris,* had pointed out the grave abuses brought about by the worldly life of the clergy. We do not know exactly to what extent the council took account of these wishes, as the proceedings have not come down to us in full.[71] Some decrees remain, forbidding the clergy to engage in unsuitable occupations and to wear unbecoming dress.[72]

The various heresies whose existence became better known through the inquiries connected with the trial of the Templars were a matter of particular attention on the part of the council. It was difficult to discover them among the Templars themselves because the testimony of the accused and their confessions were vague, incoherent, and contradictory. But the impression left by a study of this celebrated case is that great disorders, as a natural consequence of wealth, idleness, and unclerical habits of life among the knights, had found their way into several "Temples" of France. Oriental superstitions, going back perhaps, through the sects from which the Templars had taken them, to the Gnostics, Cainites, and Ophites, seem to have left traces in certain mysterious objects concerning which archaeological science has so far been unable to decide with certainty.[73]

---

[68] Raynaldi, 1312, no. 24.

[69] *Clementinae,* lib. 5, tit. 6, *De excessibus praelatorum,* and tit. 7, *De excessibus privilegiatorum.*

[70] This remarkable prelate was the nephew of the celebrated William Durandus, born at Puymoisson in Provence, author of the *Speculum juris,* legate of Pope Gregory X to the Council of Lyons.

[71] Hefele, IX, p. 454. Havemann (*op. cit.,* p. 288) suspects Philip the Fair and his followers of having something to do with this loss. What remains of these documents is to be found in Raynaldi, Mansi, Hardouin, and in the *Clementines* of the *Corpus juris canonici.*

[72] *Clementinæ,* lib. 3.

Erroneous teachings were more tangible among the Beghards, Beguines, and "Spiritual Brethren." We shall have occasion later on to speak of the doctrines spread by these sects.

An independent movement, analogous to that which led various States to free themselves from the authority of the Church, impelled certain impatient and restless souls to cast off all positive rule; and, as in the former case, they sometimes went to monstrous excesses. The sixth canon of the Council of Vienne enumerates the chief errors of the Beghards and Beguines of Germany;[74] they may be summed up in a single proposition: The perfect man is free from all moral rule. Hence were deduced revolting conclusions of immorality, which sometimes passed into practical life.[75] The fifth canon of the council abolished the Beguines' mode of life under pain of excommunication.[76]

---

[73] "Some bas-reliefs, covered with obscene figures and Arabic inscriptions, have been discovered in our day, some of them in the neighborhood of old commanderies of the Temple. E. Pfeiffer supposes that these monuments, after belonging to some Arab sects that kept the Gnostic traditions, were imported from the Orient into France by crusaders, perhaps Templars. But the so-called Arabic inscriptions of the casket of Essarois, the best known of these monuments, were certainly fabricated by persons whose knowledge of Arabic was very poor. According to S. Reinach, they are spurious. At what period were these imitations made? In the thirteenth century or in our own time? Why were they made? Was it to give credence to the existence of a secret cult with Asiatic tendencies, or was it to give an Oriental appearance to objects really intended for the followers of such a cult? We do not know." Langlois in Lavisse, *Histoire de France,* III, part 2, p. 195.

[74] Mansi, XXV, col. 410.

The Beguine heresy and corruption came from the "Spiritual Brethren," Fratricelli, Brethren of the Free Spirit, and other pseudo-mystical sects of the thirteenth century, against whom popes and councils had to act with great severity. Their origin was as follows. Towards the end of the thirteenth century, Pope Nicholas III, wishing to meet the unjust attacks made on various sides against the rule of St. Francis, declared, in the celebrated Bull *"Exiit qui seminat,"* [77] that the life of the Friars Minor was in conformity with the precepts of the Gospel and that their poverty was in imitation of that of Christ and the Apostles. Some zealous Franciscans celebrated their victory blusterously. From the papal Bull they concluded that, as the Franciscan rule summed up the precepts of Christ, every Christian was obliged to observe it, and that poverty, being a realization of Christian perfection, ought to be absolute, extending to the simple use (*usus pauper*) of the indispensable things of life. At the head of these zealots was Peter John Olivi, a young Friar Minor, born at Sevignan in Languedoc. Six centuries of study and discussion have thus far been unable to bring about an agreement among historians on this singular man, whom the sons of St. Francis continue to venerate and to defend against charges of grave doctrinal error,[78] whereas many reliable historians hold him to have been guilty of heresy.[79]

---

[75] On the Beghards and Beguines, see an article by Hefele in Wetzer and Welte's *Kirchenlexikon;* Mosheim, *De beghardis et beguinabus.*

[76] Hefele, IX, p. 431.

[77] *Decret.,* Lib. sext., c. 3, lib. 5, tit. 12.

[78] Wadding, *Annales ordinis minorum,* V, pp. 385 sq., VI, p. 197.

[79] Noël Alexander, Fleury, and others. Hefele merely reports the different opinions (IX, pp. 421 sqq.).

Olivi, a brilliant, cultivated, enthusiastic man, was convinced that the foundation of the Franciscan Order inaugurated a new era in the history of the Church. The Spirit, he believed, was about to triumph over the worship of matter. His personal life was remarkable for its austerity. He passionately loved the Church; but he would have it pure and spotless. He thundered against those who possessed earthly goods, who received an income from their property, who exacted money for funerals and enriched themselves through bequests for masses, who rode instead of walking, who were always well dressed. "Evangelical poverty," he says, "requires not only that we possess nothing, but that we use in the manner of poverty those things that we do not possess." [80] To this question he devotes a special work. Condemned by his superior general, Jerome d'Ascoli, subsequently pope under the name of Nicholas IV, for having almost deified the Blessed Virgin, Olivi submitted and burned his book with his own hand. But when summoned to Avignon to a general chapter by his new superior, Bonagratia, and then, in 1285, to Paris by Arlotto da Prato, Bonagratia's successor, he defended himself with so much ability and modesty that no decisive step was taken against him. In 1290, Pope Nicholas IV ordered an investigation of Olivi's followers and declared them imbued with erroneous opinions and guilty of rebellion. But the ardent reformer of Franciscan rule escaped from all his enemies' denunciations and all the rigorous measures of authority. He died March 6th, 1298, after receiving the Sacraments of the Church, tenacious of his ideas up to his very last breath.

His teachings, however, did not die with him. During the years preceding the Council of Vienne, the doctrine of "*usus*

---

[80] Noël Valois in *Histoire littéraire*, XXXIII, p. 481. Cf. Ehrle, *Petrus Johannis Olivi, sein Leben und seine Schriften*, in *Archiv für Literatur und Kirchengeschichte*, III, pp. 465, 498, 507, 547; Daunou, *Histoire littéraire*, XXI, pp. 46 sq.

pauper" aroused sharp controversy, and even had its martyrs.[81]

Among Olivi's disciples there was a greater evil than this fanatical defense of poverty; errors against the faith had slipped into their teaching. They taught that Baptism does indeed wipe out the "guilt" of original sin, but without conferring grace and infused virtues; they affirmed that Christ was still alive when pierced with the lance; they denied or called in question that the substance of the rational soul was by itself and by reason of its nature the "form" of the body.[82] The first of these propositions recalled the errors of the Vaudois. The second was contrary to the explicit testimony of St. John. Underlying the statement of the third proposition there was perhaps a suspicion of some error derived from the Averroist doctrine, as St. Thomas understood it, according to which each man was constituted by a vegetative or sensitive "form," while one and the same intellect or rational soul "informed" the human race. It is certain that this semi-pantheistic theory later inspired the most advanced sects of the Brethren of the Free Spirit.[83] All three propositions were condemned by the Council of Vienne.[84]

---

[81] Raimond Auriol and Jean del Primo, two friars of the monastery of Villefranche in Provence, were on this score imprisoned, chained, and treated with the utmost severity. The former succumbed, the latter survived with great difficulty. See Valois in *Histoire littéraire,* XXXIII, p. 482. Cf. Ehrle, *Zur Vorgeschichte des Concils von Vienne,* in *Archiv für Literatur,* III, pp. 42 sq., 63, 143, 155.

[82] By "form" in this connection is meant the principle of activity which differentiates beings and which, by penetrating them with its power, gives them the properties that distinguish them. In the present case, it is the rational soul that penetrates the body with its force and power, thereby giving it its "human" properties, which distinguish it from plants and animals.

[83] The condemnation by the Council of Vienne seems, however, to go farther and to include any doctrine which, while recognizing in each man an individual rational soul, would place outside of it the "form," *i. e.,* the principle of human life. (See the Brief of Pius IX, June 15th, 1867.)

[84] *Corpus juris canonici* (ed. Richter), II, pp. 1057 sq. Cf. Hefele, IX, pp. 423 sq. The doctrine opposed to the first proposition is declared more probable and more conformable to the teaching of the saints and theologians; the second proposition is said to be contrary to S. Scripture; the third is condemned as

The labors of this council wore out Pope Clement's health. In the spring of 1314 he set out for Bordeaux. Having arrived at Roquemaure on the banks of the Rhone, he found that his weakness prevented his going farther; he breathed his last April 20th,[85] after a pontificate of eight years and ten months. The Italian historians who blame him for removing the Holy See far from Rome, have often treated his memory with severity. The great difficulties of the period of transition in which Providence placed him and the ever precarious state of his health should be taken into account if we would appreciate the personal responsibility of this Pope, who was after all a remarkable man, even if he does not deserve to be called great.

heretical. Cf. Denzinger, *Enchiridion,* no. 481. Yet it is remarkable that Pope Pius IX, in his letter (April 30th, 1860) to the bishop of Breslau, in which he speaks against the errors of Canon Baltzer, who had repeated the thesis condemned at Vienne, stigmatizes it only as "erroneous" and in opposition to an interpretation of dogma. The same Pope, in a previous letter (June 15th, 1857) addressed to the archbishop of Cologne, on the subject of Günther's errors, had written that the theory denying that the rational soul is the "form" of the body, only "offends the Catholic doctrine and teaching on man." Denzinger, no. 1655. What are we to conclude from these texts except that the word "heretical" was used by the Council of Vienne in this case in the broad sense which the Inquisition gave it at that period? On this subject, see Garzend, *L'Inquisition et l'hérésie,* pp. 130–135.

[85] The death of Philip the Fair, which occurred six months later, gave rise to the legend that Jacques de Molay at the stake made an appointment to meet the Pope and the King before the judgment seat of God within the year. But no contemporary chronicler mentions this supposed prophecy.

CHAPTER IV

1316–1378

John XXII

Among Clement V's staunchest helpers and most intimate confidants was a man celebrated for the singularity of his fortune. From being the son of an humble shoemaker of Cahors, he rose to the highest dignity in the Church by the assiduity of his labors and the rectitude of his life. His name was Jacques d'Euse or d'Ossa.[1] When Clement V in 1310 appointed him bishop of Avignon, he was well advanced in years. His eminent services at the Council of Vienne (of which he was the secretary) by virtue of his deep knowledge of law and his business ability brought him the cardinal's hat and the title of bishop of Porto. Short, slender, homely, almost repulsively ugly, he had beneath this humble exterior a lofty genius and a great soul. On August 7th, 1316, after the Holy See had been vacant two years (during which the three parties, French, Italian, and Gascon, had striven without result), the Sacred College chose for a successor to the august member of the houses of Perigord and Armagnac, the son of the humble cobbler of Cahors, who took the name of John XXII.[2]

---

[1] Contemporaries wrote it Euse, d'Euse, Huèze, Duèze, and also Ossa, Osa, or Oza. Baluze (I, p. 689) and Verlaque, the latest historian of John XXII, endeavor to prove that Clement V's successor belonged to a noble family. However that may be, his father's humble profession is incontestable. *"Patre plebeio ortum trahens,"* says St. Vincent Ferrer; *"filius sutoris,"* says St. Antoninus.

[2] Villani's account (lib. 9, cap. 79), according to which Cardinal d'Ossa, selected by his colleagues as arbiter to designate the new pope, chose himself, saying: *"Ego sum papa,"* deserves no credence. In fact, it is contradicted by the accounts of several contemporary authors, generally well informed, such as Alvarez Pelayo (*De*

He was the most remarkable of all the Avignon popes.

After the example of Boniface VIII and Clement V, John XXII never lost sight of the grand project of a crusade. In fact, we may say it was the great objective of his efforts. But he encountered growing indifference on the part of princes and peoples. Opposition to the papacy was increasing everywhere. The movement aroused by the legists and the so-called "Spirituals" led to the agitation of the heterodox doctors. After Pierre Dubois and Pierre Olivi, there appeared William Occam, Marsilius of Padua, and John of Janduno, gathered about Emperor Louis of Bavaria. The center of hostilities was transferred from France to Germany.

The Empire was still vacant. John of Bohemia, a son of Henry VII, was too young to be a serious candidate for succession to his father. Germany was divided into two camps. A double election raised to the imperial throne Frederick of Austria and Louis of Bavaria. But neither of them could invoke the only title which, according to the public law of the time, constituted the official consecration of imperial right, namely, papal approbation. John XXII took a bold resolve, which showed that he belonged to the race of Gregory VII and Innocent III. On September 5th, 1316, he informed the two rivals that he was ready to act as their arbitrator, according to the right of the Holy See, and, as meanwhile the Empire remained legally vacant, he confirmed King Robert of Naples in the title of imperial vicar of Italy.

Ardent, impetuous, too proud to bow before papal arbitration, backed by almost equal forces, the two competitors preferred to entrust their fate to the arbitrament of war. Fortune

---

planctu ecclesiae, cap. 3), Ptolémée de Lucques, Pierre de Hérental (*apud* Baluze, vol. I). Moreover, the chapter in which Villani relates the anecdote is full of errors. Then, too, in an encyclical, John XXII affirms that he was elected by the unanimous vote of the cardinals. On this question, see Christophe, I, pp. 437 sq.; Verlaque, *Jean XXII, sa vie et ses œuvres,* chap. 1; G. Mollat, *L'election du pape Jean XXII,* in the *Revue de l'histoire de l'Eglise de France,* January–March, 1910.

decided in favor of Louis of Bavaria. The Austrian troops were defeated at Mühldorf (September 28th, 1322) and Frederick fell into the hands of his rival. Some months later the Diet of Nuremberg placed the imperial crown on the head of Louis of Bavaria. But the papal sanction was still lacking. The intrepid old man seated at Avignon was the less inclined to accord the title to Louis, since the new Emperor displeased the Holy See by fighting King Robert of Naples, imperial vicar, and by supporting with all his might Galeazzo Visconti, the terrible head of the Ghibellines.

Between John XXII and Louis of Bavaria there then began a renewal of the great struggle between the priesthood and the empire. The Pope had ordered Louis under pain of excommunication to give up the administration of the Empire within three months. At the Diet of Nuremberg Louis protested and asked that a general council be assembled to try the Pope.[3] The latter excommunicated Louis (March, 1324). On May 22nd, Louis published a declaration, dated from Sachsenhausen, accusing Pope John of heresy and of usurping the rights of the prince electors.[4]

Reduced to these simple proportions, the struggle forboded a graver conflict than that between Clement V and Philip the Fair. The new elements that were introduced increased its gravity still more.

The "Spiritual Brethren"

Louis of Bavaria was a passionate character, but feeble and changeable, and not of the stature of those Swabian emperors who had in former times maintained so great strife against the Roman Church. But there gathered about him all the malcontents and, in particular, that refractory branch of the Franciscans, whose "Spiritual Brethren" who, since the time of Boniface and especially since the Council of Vienne, had been under censure with their leaders and doctrines. They were seeking everywhere for strength and backing. French and English churchmen and scholars, seduced by the legists' theories, placed their pens at the service of the rebellious and obstinate Emperor. *"Defende me gladio,"* wrote the English Franciscan, William of Occam, *"et defendam te verbo"* (Defend me with your sword, and I will defend you by my pen).

---

[3] Hartzheim, *Concilia Germaniae*, IV, pp. 298 sq.; Raynaldi, 1323, nos. 34 sq.

[4] Baluze, II, pp. 378 sq.

At first glance the question that placed the group of Franciscan "Spirituals" in revolt against their legitimate superiors and against the Pope may seem to us subtle and trifling. The question was whether a Franciscan could possess anything of his own and whether Christ and the Apostles possessed anything, individually or in common. Neither the weighty decisions of popes in these matters [5] nor the violent disputes and bloody scenes marking those lengthy discussions,[6] appear to give them an important place in history. But at bottom, underlying these discussions of a theological and exegetical nature, the only form then taken by questions debated in the cloisters, the weightiest problems were involved. In maintaining that the mendicant friar, by his renunciation of all ownership, even over things of simple usage (*usus consumptibilium*), was alone raised to the imitation of Christ and to evangelical perfection, the "Spiritual" brother placed himself above the whole secular clergy, and even over its supreme head, who were not constrained to such rules of life. On the other hand, if Christ had no temporal possessions, then the vicar of Christ, exercising rights of property and dominion, could, it seemed, not do so as vicar of Christ, but only by virtue of some temporal right. Lastly, if the Saviour had thus radically condemned ownership, was it not in order to teach that ownership is an inevitable evil, tolerated by weakness, but essentially opposed to perfection? Although there was no "Spiritual" brother who then maintained such conclusions, who can deny that they were in germ in the heads of these rebellious friars? John Wyclif and John Hus later formulated the inferences.

---

[5] In 1322, John XXII drew up a Bull to declare that *"in rebus consumptibilibus,"* the *"dominium"* and the *"usus"* cannot be separated (*Extravagantes,* tit. 14, cap. 3); in 1323 he declared heretical whosoever should maintain that Christ and the Apostles possessed nothing, either individually or in common (*Extravagantes,* tit. 14, cap. 4); in 1325, to denounce these errors in their source, he condemned Pierre Olivi's commentary on the Apocalypse.

[6] The pillage of the conventual Franciscans at Carcassonne, Narbonne, and Béziers; the apostasy of several "Spirituals" who took refuge among the infidels; the execution of four "Spirituals" at Marseilles. See Hefele, IX, p. 479; Christophe, I, pp. 299–426; Pastor, *History of the Popes,* I, p. 74; Callary, *L'idéalisme franciscain spirituel au XIVe siècle.*

As for the theologians, like William of Occam and Marsilius of Padua, who united their efforts to those of the Franciscan pseudo-mystics, their doctrines were no less revolutionary. The starting-point of William of Occam's political theories seems to have been Dante's *De Monarchia*. But he added thereto certain more radical and subversive ideas. With Occam the monarchical theory of the empire was combined with a democratic theory of the Church. One of the propositions which the audacious Franciscan most often repeated is that the Christian law is a law of liberty.[7] General councils can err, as can also the pope. The only infallible rules are Holy Scripture and the dogmas accepted by the universality of the faithful. The Church, moreover, should change according to the needs of the times.[8]

Marsilius of Padua and John of Janduno

It was in 1328 that William of Occam, in company with two rebellious Franciscans, Bonagratia de Bergamo and Michael of Cesena,[9] went to Pisa to Louis of Bavaria, and placed themselves at his service. The three monks found there two learned doctors of the University of Paris who had also decided to put their minds and influence in the pay of the Emperor; they were Marsilius of Padua and John of Janduno.[10]

---

[7] Occam, *Dialogues*, part 3, tract 1, chs. 5–8.

[8] Pastor, I, p. 76.

[9] Michael of Cesena was superior general of the Order; John XXII deposed him and appointed Cardinal Bertrand de la Tour provisional administrator in his place.

Marsiglio Mainardino, known as Marsilius of Padua, was in turn physician, soldier, rector of the University of Paris (in 1313), and canon of the Church of Padua (in 1316) by the favor of Pope John XXII. He was one of those learned scholars who became encyclopedic by their studies and cosmopolitan by their personal relations, whose number the Renaissance soon multiplied in Europe. His sojourn at the University of Paris brought him into contact with John of Janduno, a teacher of theology and, like himself, a canon. They were at agreement in their ardent devotion to the rash ideas which a young school, sheltering itself under the authority of Duns Scotus, was spreading in the French capital. From the collaboration of these two men there was produced, in 1324, a strange and obscure work, its ideas in rambling disorder, its parts of unequal merit, a work so venturesome in religious as well as political questions that we can recognize in it "a rough draft of the doctrines developed at the periods of the Reformation and the French Revolution." [11] The title was *Defensor pacis*. The authors propounded the query, what might be the social conditions of that peace which Christ came to bring on earth and which is necessary for the prosperity of human society. They did not seek these conditions chiefly in the complete abolition of ownership, such as the "Spiritual Brethren" had dreamed of, or in the divine power of a universal monarchy, such as the legists affirmed. They thought to find them rather in the theory of popular sovereignty. "The only sovereign," they said, "is the people, taken as a whole, or at least the most notable portion of the citizens." [12] To the people belongs the exercise of legislative power; it would be imprudent to entrust it to a small number of even wise men, as the multitude possesses better than they what is necessary for distinguishing good from evil.[13] The agents of the executive power should be elected by the people and be dependent on them.[14] The head of the State himself, if he should overstep the limits of his powers, would be subject to removal from office by the people.[15]

---

[10] The arrival of Marsilius of Padua and John of Janduno at the court of Nuremberg very likely dates from the summer of 1326. Pastor, I, p. 76. Cf. Noël Valois in *Histoire littéraire,* XXXIII, p. 589.

[11] Valois (*Histoire littéraire,* XXXIII, p. 587) shows the existence, formerly denied, of collaboration between John of Janduno and Marsilius of Padua. (Cf. pp. 571 sq.)

It has been remarked that similar doctrines were taught by medieval authors and that expressions approaching these can be found in St. Thomas Aquinas; [16] but they never have this absolute rigor. With medieval democrats, the rights of natural justice, of the common welfare, of services performed, of custom, of individual conscience, and especially of the spiritual authority of the Church, counterbalance and moderate the rights of the community. Marsilius of Padua and John of Janduno take no account of these saving restrictions. For them the rights of the State are unlimited; it is the State, as absolutely representing sovereignty, that should regulate the citizens' activities and decide their professions. Thereby the democracy of our two sociologists meets the most radical Caesarism of the imperial legists.

These same writers were at great pains to devise an application of this democratic theory to the Church. According to them, the supreme authority in the Church is the council, which theoretically is made up of all the faithful, but, in practice, is composed of their delegates, clerical or lay.[17] Moreover, in the conflicts that might arise between Church and State, the two authors are sure to turn the scales in favor of the State. Neither bishops nor pope should have any coercive power over clergy or laity, unless it be granted them by the people, who are the authors of all law; [18] and even when this jurisdiction is granted to bishops or priests, there should always be an appeal from them to the civil power.[19] To the assembly of the faithful or its delegate, the head of the State, belongs the right to choose subjects destined for holy orders,[20] to confer benefices on them, to fix the number of churches,[21] to authorize religious institutions,[22] and to license teachers.[23]

---

[12] *"Legislatorem humanum, solam civium universitatem esse, aut valentiorem illius partem." Defensor pacis,* I, 12; III, 2; concl. 6.

[13] *Ibid.,* I, 13.

[14] *Ibid.,* I, 12 and concl. 10.

[15] *Ibid.,* I, 15.

[16] *Summa theologica,* Ia IIae, q. 105, art. 1, ad 1; q. 90, art. 4; q. 95, art. 1; IIa IIae, q. 42, art. 2, ad 3; *De regimine principum,* lib. 1, cap. 6, 10; lib. 3, cap. 11.

The two reformers showed the extreme consequences of their doctrines. For them the pope is "the dragon, the old serpent, which is the devil and Satan." [24] One of the most violent tirades in the book concludes with these words: "As a herald of truth I tell you and I cry aloud: Kings, princes, peoples, tribes of every tongue . . . these bishops of Rome are trying to bring you into subjection!" [25]

The *Defensor pacis,* written at Paris in 1324,[26] was not divulged until two years later. It was dedicated to the King of the Romans and doubtless the authors were awaiting a favorable moment for presenting it to him.

The continuator of William of Nangis experienced, as it were, a fit of horror in announcing the arrival of Marsilius of Padua and John of Janduno at the court of Louis of Bavaria, in 1326. "About this time," he writes, "these two sons of the devil came to Nuremberg." According to the same chronicler, the Emperor at first manifested some repulsion for the boldness of the work presented to him,[27] but he soon allowed himself to be won over by the clever doctor of Padua, kept the two authors among his intimate followers, and made Marsilius his regular physician. From that moment Marsilius became the King's confidant and it was probably his advice that inspired Louis of Bavaria's campaign against the Pope.[28] "The collation of the imperial crown by the Roman people," says Pastor, "their deposition of the Pope and election of an antipope in the person of the Minorite, Pietro da Corvaro, were the practical results of the teaching of the *Defensor pacis.*" [29]

---

[17] *Defensor pacis,* II, 20.

[18] *Ibid.,* II, p; III, 2; concl. 7.

[19] *Ibid.,* III, 2; concl. 37.

[20] *Ibid.,* II, 17; III, 2; concl. 21.

[21] *Ibid.,* concl. 22.

[22] *Ibid.,* concl. 29.

[23] *Ibid.,* II, 17, 21; III, 2; concl. 23, 24, 25.

[24] *Ibid.,* II, 26.

[25] *Ibid.,* II, 24. Döllinger (*Lehrbuch der Kirchengeschichte,* II, part 1, p. 259) and Pastor (I, p. 78) both remark that the system of Calvin is an offspring of the *Defensor pacis.* According to Pastor, it is not unlikely that the *Defensor pacis* exercised a direct influence upon the Geneva reformer.

[26] Géraud ed., II, p. 74. *Histoire littéraire,* XXXIII, p. 589.

In fact, when John XXII condemned the work of these two doctors of the Paris University,[30] the "priest John," as they called the Pope, was declared a heretic and unworthy of the papacy. It was resolved to march upon Rome.

On January 7th, 1328, the King of the Romans made his entry into Rome. He had himself solemnly crowned (April 18th) by Sciarra Colonna, surrounded by three Roman citizens, syndics of the people, and "the priest John of Cahors" was declared to be deprived of his dignity of sovereign pontiff. On May 12th, the Feast of the Ascension, in a popular gathering held at the Piazza San Pietro, Louis had Pietro Rainalducci of Corbario [31] acclaimed as pope. He was one of those degenerate Franciscans who, under a hypocritical semblance of austerity, gave scandal by every kind of disorder. The people, though for a moment impressed by the sight of this mendicant brother in the drugget robe, taking his place beside the Emperor, were soon disabused. In the month of August the populace stoned him out of the city with cries of "Death to the antipope! Long live the Holy See!" [32] At the Pope's word, the Guelf party had taken up arms, and Louis of Bavaria, shamed by his defeat, withdrew to Germany.

---

[27] Nangis, II, p. 75.

[28] *Histoire littéraire,* XXXIII, p. 591.

[29] Pastor, I, p. 81.

[30] Denifle and Chatelain, *Chartularium Universitatis Parisiensis,* II, p. 301; *Histoire littéraire,* XXXIII, p. 590.

[31] "*Petrum de Corbario, quem in Urbe cognovi verum hypocritam . . . inter mulierculas romanas quasi continue residentem.*" Alvarez Pelayo, *op. cit.,* lib. 1, cap. 37.

This was the signal for a reaction that was marked by unfortunate excesses. While the Romans, in the intoxication of triumph, unanimously offered John XXII the sovereignty of the city, certain extreme defenders of the papacy compromised his case in their writings. "Agostino Trionfo, an Italian, and Alvaro Pelayo, a Spaniard, have, in this matter, gained a melancholy renown," says Pastor. "As one extreme leads to another, in their opposition to the Caesaro-papacy of Marsiglio, they exalted the pope into a kind of demi-god, with absolute authority over the whole world." [33]

Pope John's activity was not limited to his struggle against the German Emperor. The progress of arts and sciences, distant missions among infidel nations, the union of the schismatic Greeks with the Catholic Church, and the undertaking of a great crusade against the Mussulmans were objects of his continual preoccupation.

While the Council of Vienne was in session, Raymond Lully, that astounding representative of science and the apostolate at the beginning of the fourteenth century, who became a martyr for the faith on African soil after dazzling the world as scholar, poet, and mystic,[34] addressed to the assembled fathers a petition in which he asked "that three colleges be founded, one at Rome, one at Paris, and another at Toledo, where devout men well versed in theology might learn the tongues of infidel lands, so as to be able to go and preach the Gospel throughout the world and die for the exaltation of the faith." The council did justice to the request and decreed that Hebrew, Arabic, and Chaldean should in the future be taught publicly wherever the Roman court should be, and also in the Universities of Paris, Oxford, Salamanca, and Bologna.[35] To John XXII is due the carrying out of this important decree.

---

[32] Villani, lib. 10, cap. 96.

[33] Pastor, I, p. 80. On the theories of Augustinus Triumphus, see Baudrillart in the *Revue d'histoire et de littérature religieuse,* 1898, pp. 334 sq.

[34] The principal works of Blessed Raymond Lully are *L'art général, Le livre des merveilles du monde, L'arbre de la philosophie de l'amour.* See Marius André, *Bienheureux Raymond Lulle;* Keicher, *Raymundus Lullus.*

Raymond Lully's death (1315) did not dishearten the missioners in Africa. The black continent was opened more and more to Christian civilization. New apostles also went to China, where, in 1306, Clement V had erected the bishopric of Peking. We still possess the reports which Andrew of Perugia and Odoric de Pordenone wrote from that country to John XXII.[36] Relations with the Greeks also became more frequent. "With the popes of Avignon," says Jean Guiraud, "there was an increase in the number of Latins who knew how to speak Greek and of Greeks who knew how to speak Latin." [37] In 1321, Marino Sanudo made a report to the Pope of his voyages to Armenia, Cyprus, and Rhodes. After the submission of Pietro of Corbario, the Pope was able to give more active attention to his crusade project. He stirred the slumbering zeal of princes, aroused the enthusiasm of the masses, and succeeded in arming four galleys which, in conjunction with the little fleet of the King of France, sailed toward Negropont, where they won a glorious victory over the combined Turkish forces." [38]

These apostolic and educational enterprises and political undertakings had called for heavy expenditures on the part of Pope John.[39] Even vaster sums seemed to him necessary for the great crusade which he planned. The financial needs were the more pressing as the revenues formerly derived from Italy no longer came to the popes at Avignon, and the tributary powers, fearing lest part of the amount paid would be handed over to France, showed themselves very irregular in meeting their engagements. Hence the need for the papacy to strengthen and develop its financial organization. To this work the Pope devoted himself with tireless energy.

---

[35] *Clementines,* lib. 5, tit. 1.

[36] Wadding, *op. cit., ad annos* 1305, 1312, 1326.

[37] Guiraud, *L'Eglise et les origines de la Renaissance,* p. 55.

[38] G. Mollat in the *Revue d'histoire ecclésiastique,* V, p. 534.

The Annates

"A man of simple habits, moderate in eating and drinking, spending little on himself, he first of all reorganized his court and took care to banish luxury from it." [40] But a wise economy in business management did not suffice to repair the deficits of the papal budgets. John XXII had recourse to a proceeding the unpopularity of which was promptly exploited by the enemies of the Holy See: it was the institution of the annates.

Pope John did not create the annates. Thomassin, in a scholarly chapter of his *Ancienne et nouvelle discipline,* shows that they were very old.[41] The taking over of one year's revenue of a small vacant benefice, such as a priory or a parish, to the profit of the greater benefice (abbey, bishopric, or archdeanery) on which it depended, was a practice that dated back to very early times. "These small benefices," says Thomassin, "seemed then as if joined again for a time to the body from which they had been severed, and the mother church was like an abundant spring receiving back into its bosom the streamlets that had formerly flowed out from it." [42]

---

[39] To these expenses, necessitated by works of science and of the apostolate and by the crusade projects, must be added the high living expenses which the Avignon popes seem to have multiplied for a double political purpose: to reassure the nations by a magnificence that would signify their independence of the French king, and to make the restless and turbulent Romans feel that the Holy See was established at Avignon *cum animo manendi.*

[40] G. Mollat in the *Revue d'histoire ecclésiastique,* V, p. 531; Muntz, *L'argent et le luxe à la cour pontificale d'Avignon,* in the *Revue des questions historiques,* LXVI, (1899), p. 5.

[41] Thomassin, *op. cit.,* part 3, bk. 2, chap. 58: Annates, their origin and progress up to the Council of Constance.

The popes could not invoke such a motive, as the benefices, great or small, had never been part of the papal domain. But with the growing centralization of their power and the consequent increase of their expenses, the popes had to devise means of support for the Church; it was natural, then, for them to resort to that form already existing. In his famous memoir to the Council of Vienne, Durand de Mend speaks vaguely of levies made for the profit of the cardinals and the pope *"quoad portionem a praelatis qui promoventur."* In 1319, John XXII decided to take, by way of extraordinary tax, for three years only, the first year's revenues of minor benefices that would fall vacant during that time. This contribution was renewed and became as of common right. The major benefices in their turn became subject to the same process; and the Bull *"Execrabilis"* having increased the number of benefices at the disposal of the pope, the practice of the annates became general. Chroniclers and poets echoed the murmurs provoked by these financial measures. "Wolves are masters in the Church," said the Spaniard Alvaro Pelayo. We find the same sentiment voiced by Dante:

> "In garb of shepherds the rapacious wolves
> Are seen from here above o'er all the pastures!
> O wrath of God, why dost thou slumber still?" [43]

An impartial observer might, indeed, consider the noble use made of these revenues by him who has been called "an incomparable administrator,"[44] and might appreciate the generosity of his inexhaustible charity.[45] But the papacy was to suffer greatly from the discredit cast upon it by these financial measures.

---

[42] *Ibid.*, ed. André, VII, p. 192.

[43] Dante (Longfellow's translation), *Paradiso*, canto XXVII, v. 55.

To this discredit was added the irritation of the Italians and Germans, offended at seeing the transfer of the papacy to Avignon confirmed by new building operations [46] and by the appointment of seven French cardinals.

A strange opinion uttered by the Pope on a doctrinal subject contributed not a little to lessening his authority in the minds of the faithful. John XXII preached very often in the Avignon churches. In the course of a sermon delivered on All Saints Day, 1331, he said that the souls of the blessed departed would not enjoy the full sight of God until after the general judgment. Although this opinion had been maintained by some of the Church Fathers, yet the general teaching of theologians was against it. The pope's enemies—Occam, Michael of Cesena, and the whole group of the "Spirituals" —shouted "heresy!" The University of Paris was disturbed. Philip of Valois, king of France, and Louis of Bavaria, emperor of Germany, thought it proper to interfere and, according to one chronicler, even to threaten.[47] Pope John at first could not restrain his anger and went so far as to imprison a Dominican friar for contradicting his view.[48] But, after gathering an assembly of cardinals and learned theologians, he gave up his opinion. Shortly afterwards (December 4th, 1334), on his death-bed, he publicly retracted the doctrine he had uttered, not as head of the Church, but simply as a private theologian. John XXII reached his ninetieth year. This great Pope lived after the manner of a simple monk, governing Christendom from a modest cell.[49] He left the papal chancery completely reorganized.[50] But opposition to the papacy was far from extinguished. The home of that opposition, which until then had been in France and Germany, was soon transferred to Rome itself.

---

[44] This is Muntz' expression, *Revue des questions historiques,* LXVI, p. 14.

[45] On this subject see the scholarly article by G. Mollat, *Jean XXII, fut-il un avare?* in the *Revue d'histoire ecclésiastique,* V, pp. 522 sq., VI, pp. 33 sq. One of Pope John's most interesting foundations was the *Pignotte* (from the Italian *pagnotta,* "small loaf of bread," according to Du Cange), the papal almshouse, which developed into vast proportions, with refectories for the poor, granaries, bakeshops, clothes magazines, etc. The memory of this institution is retained in the *Place Pignotte* at Avignon.

[46] From 1316 to 1322 John XXII bought several houses at Avignon. He also enlarged and put in order the papal residence there. Cf. Guiraud, *op. cit.,* p. 24.

[47] According to Villani, Philip VI threatened to inflict on the Pope the punishment reserved for heretics.

[48] Hefele, IX, p. 494.

Benedict XII

Neither the wise government of Benedict XII, nor the brilliant reign of the pompous Clement VI, nor the prudent administration of the austere Eugene IV had the importance of the great pontificate of Innocent VI. Under these three popes, while the young papal court of Avignon, giving itself up to the pleasures of art and letters and an easy life under the beautiful Provençal sky, was preparing the Renaissance, Rome, deprived of its pontiff, was agitated by the chimerical vision of resurrecting its ancient past. Soon it was evident that the only solution of the crisis was to be found in a prompt return of the popes to the traditional capital of Christendom. The saints were the first to perceive this and to say so to the Avignon popes. Urban V and Gregory XI understood it. Throughout the time of their pontificate their eyes were turned toward the Eternal City; but when their project could be realized, it was too late: from "the Babylonian Captivity," the papacy presently fell into the Western Schism.

---

[49] *Ibid.*, p. 493.

[50] On the pontificate of this Pope see Mollat, *Lettres communes de Jean XXII.*

After the popes became established at Avignon, the agitation in Rome and Italy grew worse. The absence of the papacy left the power in the hands of the nobility. The latter were divided and took their stand about the Colonna and the Orsini, who were ever at strife. The people, suffering from these internal dissensions, turned restlessly to the imperial power and greeted it as a liberator or surrendered to princes and foreign adventurers who founded in Italy the régime of petty tyrants. Artists and literary men were spreading about them the study of the literature and monuments of ancient Rome, awakening the pride of the Roman name. The verses of Dante weeping over enslaved Italy were frequently repeated. Under John XXII a league had been formed "to defend the liberty of the fatherland" (*pro tuenda libertate patriae* [51]).

The austere monk, Jacques Fournier, whom the unanimous vote of the Sacred College raised to the supreme dignity in the Church (December 20th, 1334), took the name of Benedict XII. From the very first days of his pontificate he turned his attention to this difficult situation. Unfortunately, his knowledge of affairs did not match his virtue. In his acts it is impossible to discover the application of any continuous systematic policy. Although deeply attached to his duties, he merely sought to ward off present abuses as soon as he discovered them. One of his first acts was to testify his solicitude for the people of Rome by devoting a large sum of money to the repair of its churches.[52] In 1335, in answer to complaints reaching him from Italy, he appointed Bertrand de Deaux, archbishop of Embrun, reformer of the territories of the Church and commissioned him to receive all the grievances of the people.[53] Bertrand obtained from the Colonna and Orsini a truce (January 19th, 1336), solemnly sworn to by both parties.[54] To strengthen his legate's authority, Benedict chose from the military Order of Knights of St. John of Jerusalem certain captains whom he charged with resisting, if need be by force, the oppressors and disturbers of the Church. But the Romans, some out of a care for the welfare of the Church, others out of haughtiness or national pride, asked for a more effective measure: the Pope's return to Rome. After some hesitation, Benedict decided not to yield to their petitions.[55] The mild and peaceful Pontiff was not forceful enough to withstand the Italian factions and would perhaps have succeeded merely in compromising his supreme authority. Besides, the King of France and the house of Anjou would have barred his way, had he taken the road to Rome.[56]

---

[51] Papencordt, *Cola di Rienzo,* p. 53.

[52] MS. 820, Italian, in the Bibliothèque Nationale, fo. 16, cited by L'Epinois, *Le gouvernement des papes,* after documents in the secret archives of the Vatican, p. 243.

[53] Theiner, *Codex diplomaticus Dominii temporalis Sanctae Sedis,* II, p. 12.

Before long the Pope himself became so attached to the bank of the Rhone that, in 1339, he laid the foundation of the splendid papal residence, which, enlarged and beautified by his successors, remained the glory of Avignon. This colossal structure, with its massive towers and imposing architecture was a stronghold rather than a palace, where, as has been said, the Western Schism prepared its fortress before breaking out.

Benedict XII gave proof of a determined resolve to correct abuses. The disciplinary measures that he enforced among the clergy of his entourage aroused such enthusiasm that a contemporary chronicler says: "The Church had fallen to the rank of Agar; Benedict gave her the dignity of Sarah.

---

[54] *Ibid.*, II, p. 11.

[55] L'Epinois, *loc. cit.*

[56] This is what Pastor says, I, p. 84. Benedict XII has been blamed for his dependence on the King of France. But it should be recognized that whenever the solicitations of the secular power appeared to him contrary to justice, he showed himself inflexible. *"Iste non timebat quemquam,"* says the *Liber pontificalis, "quando jus et justitia non servatur."* (*Lib. pont.*, II, p. 486.)

She was enslaved; he set her free."[57] The Pope was less happy in his attempts to end the conflict with Louis of Bavaria, in his efforts to unite the Greek Church with the Roman, in his plan for resuming the work of the crusades, in his measures to assure the reform of the religious Orders and the secular clergy, and in his attempt to suppress the taxes that were too heavy or unjust. When he died (April 25th, 1342), he left the political situation of the Church still threatening.

Clement VI

Pope Clement VI, who ascended the papal throne on May 7th, 1342, presented a striking contrast with his predecessor. Pierre Roger, born in the castle of Maumont near Limoges, rose in a few years, as though by magic, from one ecclesiastical dignity to another, to the highest ranks of the hierarchy. Admired by the great for his distinguishing loftiness of mind, applauded by the people for his winning eloquence, Clement VI, by his imprudent largesses, in a short time scattered the savings of the papal treasury, slowly and painfully amassed by Benedict XII. But his political understanding was keen. Pastor does not hesitate to call him "in many respects a distinguished man."[58]

Where his predecessor's sincere but clumsy good will had failed, Clement VI, favored by circumstances, succeeded. As a discreet diplomat, he strove to establish peace between France and England, persuaded the kings of those two countries to agree to the truce of Malestrout (January 19th, 1343), and, three years later, after the defeat of Crecy, successfully intervened to moderate the victor. As an able administrator, he negotiated the purchase of Avignon from the queen of Naples.[59] As a capable theologian, he obtained William of Occam's submission and put an end to the agitation of those "Spiritual Brethren" whose fanaticism had so long disturbed the Order of St. Francis and the entire Church. He maintained John XXII's firm policy toward Louis of Bavaria, cleverly obtained an advantage over the Emperor from the opposition of the house of Lützelburg and Wittelsbach, and found a rival to him in the person of Charles of Luxemburg, the grandson of Henry VII. The unexpected death of Louis of Bavaria (October 11th, 1347) hastened the success of Charles, who was crowned emperor and promised to satisfy all the requirements of the Roman curia, so much so that he received the name of "the priests' emperor." [60]

---

[57] Baluze, I, p. 232. On Benedict XII's Constitution *"Benedictus Deus"* (January 29th, 1336) condemning John XXII's error in the matter of the beatific vision, and on his *Libellus de erroribus ad Armenos*, see the two learned articles by Le Bachelet in the *Dictionnaire de théologie catholique,* II, pp. 657–704.

[58] Pastor, I, p. 88.

But we should not let ourselves be deceived as to these political triumphs. The truces between France and England soon gave way to violent conflicts; the submission of Occam and the "Spirituals" did not prevent their revolutionary ideas from silently spreading, and the docility of Emperor Charles IV changed to absolute independence toward the papacy by the publication of the Golden Bull, in 1356.

But it is from Italy, even Rome, that the most formidable danger arose. A man of the people, impassioned by his classical studies for the glories of ancient Rome and endowed with a natural eloquence and imposing stature which gave him a dominating influence over the masses, became interpreter of the aspirations of the multitude, of its grievances and dreams, which he himself cleverly fomented. He was called Nicholas or Cola di Rienzi. After Clement's election, Rienzi was a member of the Roman delegation commissioned to request the new Pope to return to Rome. The noble and generous Pontiff, himself seduced by the young man's brilliant qualities, appointed him notary of the Apostolic Chamber. Soon the people were led to believe that the Pope, through Rienzi, was going to accomplish the work of liberation and restoration which they had vainly asked of their barons, the emperor, and the popes in exile at Avignon. By inflammatory addresses, by allegorical figures calculated to strike the popular imagination, Rienzi won the confidence of the masses. In 1347, he had himself proclaimed tribune, revived the ancient magistracies, established a militia, and reorganized the police and the finances. Everything seemed to favor him. Men of letters at the court of Avignon, dazzled by whatever awoke in them the memories of Roman antiquity, encouraged the new tribune of the people. Petrarch lauded him in a triumphal ode. Clement VI addressed a brief of felicitation to him. The feudal barons, abandoned by the people and vaguely foreseeing reprisals, quit Rome and withdrew to their castles: Rienzi reigned alone over the Eternal City. His success intoxicated the dictator. He conceived the notion of extending his authority over the whole world. To his judgment seat he summoned the two rivals for the empire, attacked the temporal power of the pope, surrounded himself with senseless pomp, and fell into every excess and infamy with which he had reproached the barons. Soon everyone abandoned him. The mob turned against him. Excommunicated by the Pope and seeing that his reign was ended, Cola left Rome and retired to the monastery of Monte Majella. There, under pretext of pursuing a life of quiet meditation, he was filled with all the dreams of the Fratricelli. After two years of solitary life, he emerged, calling himself the chosen instrument of the

---

[59] It is not true that Joanna of Naples, accused of complicity in the assassination of her husband, sold Avignon to Clement VI in exchange for absolution. But it is true that the 80,000 florins stipulated in the sale enabled Joanna to repel the avenging troops of her brother-in-law. Bouche, *op. cit.,* II, p. 370. Christophe, II, pp. 141 sq., 465–471. According to Muntz, the florin was worth about fifteen dollars. *Revue des questions historiques,* LXVI, p. 5.

[60] Pastor, I, p. 86. Hemmer, under the word *Clément VI,* in the *Dictionnaire de théologie catholique,* III, col. 70.

Holy Ghost for the regeneration of the world. He betook himself to Emperor Charles IV, proposing to lead him to the conquest of Italy. But Charles put him under arrest as suspected of heresy and sent him to Clement VI. The Pope, after keeping him for some time in the upper part of the Trouillas tower, gave him freedom within the city of Avignon, under the surveillance of the police.

This was another political triumph for Clement VI. But the moral consequences of such agitations were serious. It could not be indifferent to the good order of Christendom that, in the heart of the Eternal City, the legists' spirit of revolt should be found, in the person of one man, combined with the wildest dreams of the "Spiritual Brethren" and the sensual pomp of the pagan Renaissance.

Some time before his death, the Sovereign Pontiff, through the mediation of Bishop Hemming, one of the upper Scandinavian clergy, received the following letter "written in the name of Christ and at His dictation: 'I, Jesus Christ, exalted you. I had you advance from honor to honor. Arise. . . . Go to Italy and there contemplate the places sprinkled with the blood of My saints. . . . I have been patient; but now My time is near at hand; yours is drawing to a close. I will require of you an account of your neglect. . . . You can reform and improve many things; but you have been unwilling to do so.' . . . If you ask what spirit inspires such words, know that you are acquainted with her who writes. . . . Examine the book of your conscience and you will perceive that I speak the truth." She who wrote thus was, in fact, already known to the head of the Church. It was Brigid of Sweden, seneschale of Nericia, first lady of the palace at the Stockholm court. Great in the world, she was still greater by the supernatural revelations with which God favored her, by the foundation of the Order of the Saviour, which she established at Vadstena, and by the remarkable austerity of her virtues. In the presence of the inactivity of His pontiff, God raised up a woman from the ranks of the simple faithful to remind him of his duties. On December 2nd, 1352, Brigid had another vision. "The hour of wrath has come," Christ said to her; "I will judge this Pope, who has scattered the flock of Peter. However, if he turns to Me, I will hasten to meet him like a tender father." In an ecstasy Brigid saw the Pontiff's soul ready to appear before its judge, seized with fright at the aspect of the demon and at the same time consumed with a desire to possess the God of love.[61] She thought that Pope Clement's charity [62] and his fidelity to his duties as a Benedictine monk would save him from the sufferings of Purgatory.

Innocent VI

Clement VI died December 6th, 1352. Twelve days later the cardinal-bishop of Ostia, Etienne Aubert, also a native of Limoges, was chosen to succeed him. He took the name of Innocent VI. At the very time that he was being enthroned, Christ again spoke to His servant Brigid, saying to her: "Pope Innocent is a man of better tempered metal than his predecessor. If he knew the revelations I have made to you, he would become still better. . . . His good will shall take the place of deeds and shall be rewarded."

After the death of Clement VI, the cardinals were afraid of the possible scandals of a papacy too worldly and too absolute. By an instinctive action, excessive but easy to explain, they wished to limit the pope's powers by those of the Sacred College and at the same time to raise to the Holy See, not a statesman, but a man of prayer, John Birel, the general of the

---

[61] *Révélations de Sainte Brigitte,* bk. 9, chap. 144; bk. 6, chap. 96.

[62] Generous and chivalrous, Clement VI showed great courage during the terrible "black plague" of 1348 and 1349. When the people held the Jews responsible for it, he threatened with excommunication anyone who should molest them.

Carthusians. But they thought better of it. Fearful of a reform that would have made of the pope a sort of constitutional sovereign, the wisest of them added the clause: "If the act is in conformity with right." John Birel declined the offer of the papacy. The conclave of 1352 did not repeat the sorry imprudence of the conclave of 1294, which snatched Pietro di Murrone from his solitary retreat in the desert to entrust him with a responsibility beyond his talents. A more enlightened inspiration prompted it to elect the virtuous and learned Etienne Aubert, who had been professor of civil law and chief justice of the city of Toulouse. He gave promise of being a wise and prudent ruler.

One of the first acts of the new Pope was to annul, as "not conforming to right," the constitution drawn up by the Sacred College in a time of anxiety and perhaps under pressure from the French court.[63] On the other hand, he considered it his duty to be guided, so far as possible, by the counsels of John Birel and, as we are told by a chronicler, "if the new Pope did not run into the abuses of mysticism, if he showed himself more restrained in the distribution of favors, if in his reign benefices were generally bestowed on worthy subjects, it is due to the letters of the man of God."[64] Thus the Pope who became the defender of the hierarchy did not hesitate to recognize the need which that hierarchy often has of seeking the respectful and submissive aid of holiness.

Innocent VI banished luxury from the papal court, reduced the number of those in his service, abolished many reservations and commends, sent back to their churches the numerous prelates who were living at Avignon without having been called thither, and threatened with excommunication all who should fail in the duty of residence.[65]

---

[63] Hefele, IX, p. 589.

[64] Dorlandi, *Chron. carthus.*, bk. 4, chap. 22. When Birel died a few years later, Innocent VI exclaimed: "God grant that my soul may appear before Him as pure as that of Father Jean Birel. The Church has lost the holiest of her priests."

Since the departure of Cola di Rienzi, the city of Rome had fallen back into anarchy, and from anarchy, as by a natural inclination, into a dictatorship. The new tribune, Baroncelli, a man of the people, more vain and brutal than his predecessor, terrorized the city by cruelties and stained it by his excesses. Innocent VI, who was deceived by Rienzi's behavior, supposed he had been improved by his trials and decided to set up the former tribune against the new one. This was an act of imprudence. Rienzi, received at Rome as a liberator, lost no time in reviving the most hateful despotism. But his dictatorship was of short duration. Just when he had taken the terrified silence reigning in the city as a sign of complete submission, an insurrection suddenly broke out (October 8th, 1354). Cries of "Death to the traitor Rienzi!" resounded on all sides. As he tried to escape, he was attacked by the populace, who massacred him after making him undergo the most shameful treatment.

For reëstablishing order in Italy, Innocent VI found a man of genius, Cardinal Albornoz. Aegidius Alvarez d'Albornoz, a Spaniard of royal blood, had been a captain, councillor of the king, and archbishop of Toledo. Under Peter the Cruel, whose crimes he courageously reproved, he thought it prudent to withdraw from his country. The Pope, appreciating his high qualities, conferred on him the most extensive powers, civil and military as well as religious, over all Italy. In four months, by his able and diplomatic negotiations, his military expeditions, the dominance of his knowledge and virtues, and his untiring activity, he succeeded in restoring independence to the domain of St. Peter, in forcing the petty Italian tyrants to make their submission, in assuring respect for canonical regulations among the religious and secular priests, and in establishing some order in civil society by a code of laws admirably suited to the circumstances. On Easter, 1355, in a peaceful Italy, he was able to have Charles IV crowned emperor in the name of the Pope. Albornoz possessed the wonderful secret, not only of overcoming opposition and captivating men's minds, but also of winning their hearts. A resolute pope who would have set out for Rome at that time would have aroused unanimous acclamations along his entire progress in Italy.[66] Unfortunately old age and illness prevented Innocent VI from carrying out such a project.

---

[65] Raynaldi, 1352, nos. 25–30; 1353, nos. 29–31.

This delay caused the situation to grow worse. The frequent demands which the Avignon popes were obliged to make for money caused more and more discontent among the States. To shield herself from these levies, England had recourse to severe legislative measures.[67] The dissatisfaction of Germany was shown in another way, due to a lack of united action; but those concerned, oppressed by national wars, individually expressed their irritation by murmuring. The alienation of the papacy was the result. The famous Golden Bull of January 13th, 1356 (so named from the golden capsule on which the seal of the empire was imprinted) may be considered as the most serious result of this silent opposition. "In agreement with the prince electors, counts, and other nobles," as we are told in the preamble of the famous document, Emperor Charles IV definitively and exclusively transferred the right of choosing the sovereign to seven privileged electors; the confirmation of the newly elected by the pope was passed over in silence; no account was taken of the right, which the pope claimed, of appointing imperial vicars in case of vacancy.

---

[66] See his letter to Charles IV (April 28th, 1361) in Martène, *Thesaurus,* II, pp. 946 sqq.

[67] Lingard, *History of England,* II, chap. 7, pp. 366 sqq.

Innocent VI protested. The personal relations of friendship between the Pope and the Emperor moderated the controversy; but the breach made in the traditional privileges of the papacy was extremely important. In short, when Innocent VI breathed his last (September 22nd, 1362), in the tenth year of his pontificate, the bright prospect which, for a moment, was offered the papacy by the genius of Albornoz, was already imperilled.

Urban V

The choice of the Sacred College, after hesitating over the name of the celebrated Spanish cardinal, fixed upon the Benedictine abbot of St. Victor of Marseilles, William Grimoard, who was nuncio at Vienna. He took the name of Urban V. Petrarch, echoing the public opinion, greeted this election as the result of a divine inspiration. In fact, the Church was later to raise this Pope to her altars. Two great events were to make his pontificate one of the most important in history: the return of the papacy to Rome and the reëstablishment of the Holy Roman Empire.

The Pope's return to Rome, which had not seen its bishop for sixty years, was a veritable triumph. When (October 16th, 1367) Urban V arrived before the gates of the city, whose half-ruined buildings presented a sight of lamentable decay, as if the very stones bemoaned the absence of the popes, his return was greeted with popular enthusiasm. John Colombini, the founder of the Jesuates, placing himself at the head of his companions, had gone with them as far as Corneto, singing psalms. Petrarch, to commemorate the Pope's return, borrowed words from the Psalmist: "When Israel went out of Egypt, the house of Jacob from a barbarous people"; on all sides there were signs of joy and gladness.

After spending three years in the Eternal City to reëstablish order and, according to his familiar expression, "peace in justice," [68] Urban V, thinking his presence was needed in France to halt the threatening hostilities between that country and England, sailed from Corneto on September 5th, 1370. He was destined not to see Italian soil again; sickness sapped his strength and soon brought him to the grave.

His stay in Rome had been marked by an event which seemed to fulfil the most magnificent dreams of a Gregory VII and an Innocent III. Emperor Charles IV came thither to solemnly confirm the accord between the Empire of the West and the Church,[69] and John Palaeologus, emperor of the East, there abjured the Greek schism.[70] The ruler of Byzantium came to ask help against the Mussulmans. But the time of the great crusades was past. A few years before, in 1365, Pierre du Lusignan could have been seen scouring Europe and again stirring the popular imagination and the enthusiasm of a handful of knights with the idea of conquering the Holy Land; and you might have seen Blessed Peter Thomas, papal legate, and the king of Cyprus set out for the East with the illusion that all Europe was going to follow in their footsteps. But the princes and nobles who promised their assistance devoted themselves instead to the care of their political interests. The great maritime powers, contented with their treaties with the Mussulmans, were opposed to the whole undertaking.[71] England, which formerly had taken so brilliant a part in these Christian expeditions, showed herself especially cold. And it was from England that came the most formidable opposition and the most painful revolt that the papacy had had to suffer for a long time.

---

[68] The utility of this short sojourn of Urban V at Rome has sometimes been doubted. In L'Epinois (*op. cit.*, pp. 327–337), see the enumeration, with supporting evidence, of the important reforms carried out at Rome by Urban V.

[69] Pastor, I, p. 95.

[70] Baluze, I, p. 388.

[71] Brehier, *L'Eglise et l'Orient au Moyen Age,* p. 300.

We saw above that, for some time past, the taxes levied by the Avignon popes had aroused recriminations among the English people. "The laity at this time," says Hume, "seem to have been extremely prejudiced against the papal power, and even somewhat against their own clergy, because of their connections with the Roman pontiff. The Parliament pretended that the usurpations of the pope were the cause of all the plagues, injuries, famines, and poverty of the realm. . . . At another time, they petition the king to employ no churchman in any office of state; and they even speak in plain terms of expelling by force the papal authority. . . . Men who talked in this strain, were not far from the Reformation." [72]

One of the most unpopular tributes was that of £1000 annually which England owed to the Holy See since the time of John Lackland, who promised it when the interdict against him was lifted. The people considered this as a sign of vassalage against which the feeling of national autonomy protested, and for several years the tribute had no longer been paid. But the question of right remained unsettled. In 1367, when Urban V renewed his demand, King Edward III referred the solution of the question to Parliament, which decided that King John did not have the right, without the nation's consent, to subject his realm to a foreign power. This was enlarging the question. But what still more aggravated the matter was the intervention of a theologian, John Wyclif, who was invited to appear before Parliament to give his advice. He declared that, from the point of view of divine and ecclesiastical law as well as that of national law, King John's promise was radically null and void.

John Wyclif, whom this incident introduced into the political world, soon after condensed into his teaching all the temerarious and heretical opinions, destructive of discipline and Christian dogma, which had been uttered by the enemies of the papacy for two centuries past—Albigenses and Vaudois, Apocalyptics and "Spirituals," followers of Occam and of Marsilius of Padua. His doctrine served as a connecting link to join all these sects to the Protestant Revolt.

---

[72] Hume, *History of England,* ch. 16, II, p. 273.

Born in 1324 in the village of Wyclif, which has given him his name, John studied philosophy, theology, civil and canon law at the celebrated University of Oxford, where William of Occam's spirit of revolt had unfortunately left some traces. The restless, ambitious, passionate soul of the new doctor exaggerated these dangerous tendencies. In 1356 was published his treatise *De ultima aetate Ecclesiae,* full of bitter denunciations against the state of the Church and abounding in apocalyptical dreams about the approaching end of the world. In the conflicts between the University and the Mendicant Orders, he accused the latter, in the style of a coarse pamphleteer, of "infecting the atmosphere" [73] and of putrefying humanity. With immoderate ardor he undertook the defense of Parliament against the Pope in a new pamphlet, *Determinatio quaedam Magistri Joannis W. de dominio contra unum monachum.* All this was merely the prelude of fresh audacities, the scandal of which was spared the holy Pontiff then ruling the Church, for on December 19th, 1370, Urban V, lying on an humble cot and clothed in the Benedictine habit, which he had never abandoned, gave up his soul to God.[74]

Gregory XI

On the 29th of the same month, in a conclave that lasted only one day, the College of Cardinals, counting fifteen Frenchmen, three Italians, and one Englishman, raised to the pontifical throne a young cardinal, thirty-six years old, Pierre Roger of Beaufort Turenne, who took the name of Gregory XI. He was a nephew of Pope Clement VI. His pale and gentle features and the modest gravity of his bearing, even more than his noble birth, made him pleasing to all. He bowed before a call which he considered the will of God. It is said that, upon assuming the tiara, he made a vow to carry it back to Rome. Undoubtedly the young Pontiff had no illusions as to the difficulties of such an undertaking. But the need of departing from Avignon left him no choice.

---

[73] *"Inficientes aerem cum ingurgitato stomacho et sudoribus evaporatis."* (*Trialogus,* cap. 35.)

[74] Urban V was beatified by Pius IX, who fixed his feast on December 19th.

Since the death of Cardinal Albornoz, Italy had fallen back into anarchy. Over and above individual animosities dividing the petty States and setting faction against faction, a common national feeling aroused the whole population of the peninsula more and more against the papal régime. The hasty departure of Urban V for Avignon and the composition of the Sacred College, in which French influence had become preponderant, made the Italians fear seeing the papacy definitively abandon Rome and become a political instrument in the hands of the French kings. Hatred for foreigners and resistance to the "evil pastors of the Church" were the watchwords of an insurrection headed by the Florentine Republic. This latter attributed to the legates of the Holy See calamities whose deepest cause was to be found in its own political constitution and pagan morals.[75] The Florentines, unfurling a red flag on which was inscribed the word "Libertas," revolted with cries of "Death to the legates!" Following Florence, the cities of Milan, Perugia, and Città di Castello also raised the standard of rebellion.

In vain did the peaceful and timid Pontiff try to use methods of gentleness.[76] The tumultuous populace and the nobles, stirred by the old Ghibelline animosities, seemed not to hear. The prior of the Carthusians at Florence, clothed with the power of nuncio, was seized by the crowd, flayed alive, and paraded through the streets in a cart. "Diabolical men," as St. Antoninus calls them, usurped the power and spread terror everywhere.[77] Gregory, deciding that the time had come for resort to spiritual weapons, issued a formidable decree against the rebellious city. The Florentines and their followers were excommunicated; the city was placed under the interdict and declared outlawed; all past treaties with the city were proclaimed null and void; it was explicitly forbidden, under pain of excommunication, to supply its inhabitants with wood, bread, or wine.[78] On his side, Emperor Charles IV hurled anathema against the Florentines. But the irritation was too great to halt before these spiritual penalties; faith was too weak for an interdict, however severe, to be able, as formerly, to make a whole people recoil. The papal Bull only exasperated the raging rebels.

---

[75] Pastor, I, p. 100.

[76] Raynaldi (1375, no. 17) prints a paternal letter from the Pope to the Florentines.

In the Sacred College, a man whose talents were as readily displayed on the battlefield as in the council chamber, Cardinal Robert, count of Geneva, proposed to raise an army of ten thousand men "of every tongue and tribe" and to march at its head against the revolting provinces. Gregory, seeing no other way of meeting the danger, consented and bestowed full power on the terrible Cardinal, whom St. Antoninus in his History compares to Herod and Nero. It meant open war between the last Avignon pope and Italy. A body of 400 Gascon lances, making 1200 men, and a Breton company of a thousand horse poured into Italy under the command of Jean de Malestrout, Silvester de Budes, and Raymond de Turenne, answering pillage by pillage, blood by blood.[79]

---

[77] St. Antoninus, *Hist.*, part 3, tit. 23, ch. 14, no. 16.

[78] Raynaldi, 1376, nos. 1–6; Capecelatro, *Histoire de sainte Catherine de Sienne*, p. 108.

[79] Muratori, *op. cit.*, XVI, p. 526.

Suddenly, amid these scenes of slaughter, a maiden's voice was raised. St. Catherine was born at Siena, in 1347, of a humble bourgeois family. Her father, Jacob Benincasa, a simple and upright man, was a dyer. Up to the time she entered the Third Order of St. Dominic in 1365, she had led a hidden life, practicing the humblest virtues of the Christian religion. But the evils from which the Church was suffering afflicted her heart. In 1376 her confessor, Raymond of Capua, arriving from Florence, related to her the horrors of the war that was going on. Catherine knelt before her crucifix and remained there about an hour in deep meditation. When the humble "mantellata" of St. Dominic arose, one would have said she was a wholly new person. Henceforth her voice was to be heard throughout her life by peoples and rulers, dominating the tumult of quarrels and wars. Brigid, the noble maiden of Sweden, was no longer alone in making known the prophetic words which God inspires amid great crises. A century earlier, Rose of Viterbo had been the soul of the Guelf party in Italy; a half century later another maid, Joan of Arc, received a mission to rescue the most Christian kingdom. The vocation of Brigid of Sweden and Catherine of Siena was greater still: it was to the papacy they were directed to address themselves. Very different were their characters and origin. The one embodied the ancient feudal nobility, the other the young bourgeoisie of modern times; through Brigid the northern races, through Catherine the southern seemed to have found their interpreters; the former always spoke in the name of Christ, the latter in the name of the Christian peoples, but both had the same mission; namely, to beg the pope to bestow peace on the nations, to reform the morals of the clergy, and to return to Rome.

At the beginning of 1371 St. Brigid wrote to Pope Gregory XI: "Holy Father, hear the words addressed to you by Jesus Christ: 'Your worldly court is ruining My heavenly court.

. . . Almost every soul that goes to your court you send into the hell of fire. . . . Go to Rome, to your See, as soon as you possibly can.' "[80] Surely, if cruel and sensual paganism reigned in the Italian courts, the court of Avignon, where so many fashionable women (from Miramonde de Mauleon, niece of Clement V, to Almodie de Besse, niece of Clement VI, and Enemonde de Boulbon, niece of Innocent VI) "had so gaily written light poetry in every kind of Provençal rhythm,"[81] did not breathe that fragrance of piety which the Church had a right to expect.

The very day when Blessed Raymond of Capua, her confessor, told her of the desolation of Florence, Catherine wrote to the Pope: "Most Holy Father, your unworthy daughter Catherine, servant and slave of the servants of Jesus Christ, writes to your Holiness with a desire of seeing you unite your children in peace. . . . You are spending the patrimony of God's poor for soldiers who destroy human lives, and thus is hindered your holy desire to reform the Church, your spouse."[82] In another letter she says to the Pope: "Fill the heart of the Church with the ardent love that she has lost; for she has been so drained of blood by the iniquitous men who have devoured her that she is wholly wan."[83] "The letters addressed by St. Catherine to Pope Gregory XI," says Pastor, "are unique in their kind. She looks at everything from the highest point of view, and does not scruple to tell the Pope the most unwelcome truths, without, however, for a moment forgetting the reverence due to the Vicar of Christ."[84]

---

[80] *Révélations de sainte Brigitte,* bk. 4, ch. 142. Cf. *Acta sanctorum,* October, IV, p. 427.

[81] Jean de Nostredame, *Les vies des plus célèbres et anciens poètes provençaux.*

[82] Tommaseo, *Le lettere di santa Caterina di Siena,* III, p. 172.

[83] *St. Catherine of Siena as Seen in her Letters,* p. 133.

[84] Pastor, I, p. 104.

Catherine's embassy to the court of Avignon on behalf of the Florentine government, in June 1376, failed to attain the desired result, as the Florentine authorities persisted in forcing unacceptable conditions on the Pope. But she profited by her stay at Pope Gregory's court to encourage the Pontiff in the three undertakings which God had charged her to exhort the Pope to carry out, namely, the establishment of peace between the nations, the reform of the clergy, and the return of the papacy to Rome.

The pontificate of Gregory XI improved conditions as much as the misfortune of the times permitted. At the beginning of his reign, he succeeded in bringing about peace between France and England. He put an end to the wars that were laying waste Castile, Aragon, and Navarre. His negotiations with Germany were also of a peace-making nature. "War and the want of virtue," St. Catherine told him, "are the two causes of the Church's ruin." [85]

The Pope yielded to the Saint's insistence. Several of his letters are concerned with the holding of provincial councils, the organization of the crusade, the reform of the monasteries and of the clergy.

Italy alone seemed farther from peace and reform than ever. Catherine repeated to the Pontiff that the only remedy was his speedy departure for Rome. "Go," she said, "restore the greatness of Rome, that garden which was and is even now sprinkled with the blood of martyrs. Rome still has need of martyrs." [86] Gregory indeed would be a martyr if, in the broad sense of the word, it is martyrdom to break the dearest ties of family and friendship in the performance of duty, to risk the enmity of a powerful sovereign, and to go off into a country whose language he did not know, to the midst of a people prejudiced against him, to die under the burden of his sufferings and of an unhealthy climate.[87] This was his lot. Despite so many obstacles, he courageously took the road to Rome, reaching there on January 17th, 1377. A little more than a year later he drew his last breath, beset by the gloomiest forbodings.[88]

---

[85] Tommaseo, III, p. 176.

[86] Capecelatro, *op. cit.*, pp. 129 sqq., 155, 214 sq.

Thus ended the period commonly called "the Babylonian Captivity" of the papacy. This expression, however, is an exaggeration if we mean that for almost seventy years the popes were slaves to the policy of French kings or to the "soft delights of the Provençal country." A John XXII and a Gregory XI, to speak only of these two, were able to follow a personal policy; and around the supposed Babylon, what saints there were to adorn the fourteenth century with the gentlest and the sternest virtues! For example, there was that noble Provençal lord, St. Elzear of Sabran, who ruled his house like a monastery, where they conversed only of the things of God and where they busied themselves only with works of charity. Engaged in worldly affairs to the extent that he thought useful to the Church and his country, he died at Paris in 1323, during an embassy to King Charles the Fair. His holy widow, St. Delphine, had the happiness of witnessing his canonization by Urban V in 1369 and rejoined him in Heaven a few months later. In the Chartreuse of Cella-Robandi, near the little town of Arcs in Provence, the lovable St. Roseline of Villeneuve, the glory of the Carthusian Order, gave up her soul to God, June 11, 1329, after a life of prayer and wonderful purity. Two years earlier, St. Roch, the pious pilgrim, born at Montpellier toward the beginning of Philip the Fair's reign, after edifying Languedoc and Italy, left this world August 16th, 1327. His name, renowned by the miracles wrought at his tomb, thenceforth was invoked by the people against various epidemics. More distant from the center of Christianity, Spain gave to Heaven, about the same period, St. Peter Pascal (1300) and St. Peter Armengol (1304); Portugal, its queen, St. Elizabeth (1336); Italy, Blessed Angela of Foligno (1309), Blessed Colombini (1367), and St. Juliana of Falconieri (1314); Germany, Blessed Herman (1327), Blessed Otto (1344), and the two prophets St. Mechtilde (1305) and St. Gertrude (1334), noble relatives of Emperor Frederick II. In warlike Hungary, disturbed by terrible dramas during this fourteenth century, the virtues of St. Elizabeth were handed down in two of her grandnieces, Helen and Margaret, whom the Church honors on March 6th. Surrounding Blessed Urban V, such souls formed an admirable crown of holiness for the Church of the fourteenth century.[89]

---

[87] Pastor, I, p. 110.

[88] Gerson (*Tract. de examin. doctrina,* pars II, consid. 3) says that Gregory XI on his death-bed advised his cardinals "to distrust men and women who, under cover of religion, relate visions of their brains." But this is not likely, at least if we are to take the Pope's supposed words as referring to St. Brigid and St. Catherine of Siena. Gerson, who was not an eye-witness of the scene, may have given a false interpretation to the accounts of Gregory's last moments.

---

[89] Cf. Mollat, *Les papes d'Avignon* (1305–1318).

CHAPTER V

1378–1417

On March 19th, 1378, Gregory XI, with a premonition of approaching death, foreseeing the difficulties that might attend the choice of his successor, decreed that every future papal election, even under abnormal conditions, should be considered valid as soon as a candidate received a majority vote of the Sacred College. At the same time he forbade the commandant of Castel Sant' Angelo to turn over the keys of the fortress to anyone without an order from the cardinals at Avignon.[1] But the passions let loose after his death made these wise precautions inadequate.

Urban VI

When, on Wednesday, April 7th, 1378, the cardinals assembled in conclave, an immense and partly armed crowd, estimated by an eye-witness at 20,000 persons, occupied the Piazza San Pietro, as also the portico and steps of the basilica, surrounded the Vatican, and filled the windows and roofs of nearby houses. As each cardinal passed through the crowd on his way to the conclave, he was greeted by the cry, as unanimous as it was threatening: *"Romano lo volemo, o almanco italiano!"* (We want a Roman, or at least an Italian.) The last one to pass through the crowd was the aged Cardinal Francesco Tebaldeschi, surnamed the Cardinal of Saint Peter's. The night was much disturbed. When morning came, it seemed that the votes were already inclining to Bartolomeo Prignano, archbishop of Bari, well known for his eloquence, his austere life, and his ability in handling public affairs. It is a curious fact that two of the cardinals, who later on were to be most responsible for the schism, seem to have become the warmest backers of this candidate. "By these holy Gospels," cried the terrible Cardinal Robert of Geneva, "the pope we shall have is the Archbishop of Bari or another whom I do not yet wish to name." That other was himself, the future Clement VII.[2] The future Benedict XIII, the Spaniard Pedro de Luna, the most fearless of all, when he heard the crowd's threatening cries, proclaimed with a smile that he would meet death rather than yield to terror. On Thursday morning he declared to the Bishop of Jaen that he was quite resolved on the election of the Archbishop of Bari.[3]

---

[1] Baluze, II, col. 813.

With the coming of dawn, the tumult of the crowd became more disquieting. The tocsin was rung. The bells of St. Peter's in turn began to swing. "They are ringing for catechumens or some exorcism," said the good old Cardinal Tebaldeschi. "That exorcism will hardly be to my taste," replied Cardinal de Bretagne, trembling.[4]

Some of the cardinals tried to parley through a wicket with the more and more turbulent throng, which had forced the doors and was filling the Vatican palace with its shouts. But this attempt of the cardinals was labor lost. Then, on the motion of Pedro de Luna, by the unanimous vote of all the cardinals save one, Archbishop Bartolomeo Prignano of Bari was elected pope. Because of the menacing tumult outside, some of the cardinals felt constrained to say: "I vote freely for Prignano." They waited for the crowd to grow somewhat calmer before notifying them of the election. The throng did become quieter a few hours later, after the cardinals had said some prayers in the chapel and had breakfasted. "Now that everything is calm," said one of the electors, "are we all of the same mind? Do we still adhere to the Archbishop of Bari's election?" "Yes, yes," answered thirteen out of the sixteen cardinals. The other three were absent.

---

[2] Baluze, I, col. 1101; Noël Valois, *La France et le grand schisme d'occident,* I, p. 27.

[3] Valois, I, p. 27.

[4] Depositions reported by Valois, I, p. 40.

But the monentary calm of the mob was only the prelude of a still greater tumult. Presently the shouting redoubled and became more impatient and threatening. The shouts: *"Italiano!"* were stifled by cries of *"Romano! Romano!"* What the people wanted was a Roman pope. *"Romano lo volemo,"* they shouted; *"se non e romano, tutti li occideremo"* (If the pope is not a Roman, we will kill him along with all the cardinals). The young Cardinal Orsini came out of the chapel and entered into communication with the crowd. "You have a pope," he cried. "Who is it?" "Go into St. Peter's." Someone understood or pretended to understand: "It is the cardinal of St. Peter's," that is, Tebaldeschi. He was a Roman. The crowd acclaimed his name. Then it was that some cardinals in fright had the weakness to advise the old Cardinal of St. Peter's to put on the pontifical vestments. This, they thought, was the only means to quiet the people for the moment. They would tell them the truth when the excitement subsided. The old Cardinal, carried along by the multitude, used what little strength he had to protest against the deception that was being imposed upon him. "I am not the pope. It is the Archbishop of Bari." Thus it was that the name of the real pope reached the crowd, but amidst such confusion and such incertitude that the cardinals had time to escape the rage that would doubtless have fallen on them if the name of Cardinal Prignano had been hastily announced to the irritated throng. But Pedro, unaccompanied, fearlessly passed through the crowd on his way home, imposing respect for his person by his very bearing.[5] On April 8th, if we are to believe Raymond of Capua, he said:

---

[5] See the evidence in Valois, I, p. 54.

"We have elected a real pope; the Romans will have to tear me limb from limb before I go back on today's election." [6]

If the other cardinals did not speak their minds with like energy, they seemed no less free from doubt in the matter. On the day after the election, they enthroned the new Pope, who took the name of Urban VI. The solemn coronation ceremony took place on Easter, April 18th. Four days before, Robert of Geneva, the future Clement VII, had sent word of the event to King Charles V of France. Several months passed without anyone thinking of revoking or reconsidering what had been done. The cardinals accepted the validity of all the new Pontiff's acts, sought favors of him without scruple, and in their official acts as well as in private conversation regarded him as the legitimate head of the Church.

Even had the cardinals' first choice been influenced by fear, it would seem that their subsequent acts ratified that first decision. Urban VI was a legitimate pope, or at least legitimated.[7]

Who was to blame for the complete change that soon afterward occurred in the Sacred College? Was Urban VI blinded by power? Was his reason disturbed by the tragic vicissitudes accompanying his election? Will a simple indiscretion of zeal or excessive harshness of character account for the regrettable incidents that marked the beginning of the new Pope's reign? In times of disturbance, when men's minds are excited, the least misstep of those who hold the responsibility of power may precipitate a crisis. Urban VI, who possessed a lofty character and unquestionable austerity, rightly thought that there was no more important work for him to undertake than the reform of the Church. Public opinion called for it, *in capite et in membris.* He resolved to begin by reforming the head. He observed the customary fasts and penances with the utmost rigor and performed his ecclesiastical duties with model punctuality. It was reported that he constantly wore a haircloth shirt.[8] He declared war on simony and on the misconduct and worldly manners of clergymen. His severity was unparalleled and as a natural result awakened animosities. His contempt for the amenities went so far as to offer gross offense to the cardinals, one of whom he called an imbecile, another a libertine; a third one he silenced in open consistory by calling on him to stop his "stupid babbling." [9] Men of the stamp of Pedro de Luna and Robert of Geneva were not inclined to support such proceedings on the part of him whom they had just elected. Indignation soon became general. One day, when the Pope in plenary consistory complained of having too many Frenchmen in the Sacred College and expressed his intention of forming an Italian majority by new promotions, a French cardinal was seen to grow suddenly pale and abruptly leave the hall.[10] It was Cardinal Robert of Geneva. The revolt had begun.

---

[6] Deposition of Raymond of Capua. Baluze, I, col. 1462; Valois, I, p. 73.

[7] We have treated the election of Urban VI at some length because it is of capital importance in the question of the Western Schism. On Urban's legitimacy depends the legitimacy of Boniface IX, Innocent VII, and Gregory XII at Rome and the illegitimacy of Clement VII and Benedict XIII at Avignon. Valois, after minutely relating all the incidents of the election, concludes that "the solution of the great problem presented to the fourteenth century still eludes the judgment of history." (*Op. cit.,* I, p. 82.) Baudrillart, on the basis of the very facts established by Valois, confidently decides in favor of Urban's legitimacy. (*Bulletin Critique,* 1896, pp. 148 sq.) Such is also the conclusion of Salembier, *The Great Schism of the West,* pp. 43-48; Chénon in Lavisse and Rambaud, *Histoire générale,* III, p. 319; Pastor, I, p. 120; Kirsch, in his edition of Hergenröther's *Kirchengeschichte.* The reasons that militate in favor of Urban's illegitimacy have been developed by Hemmer in the *Revue d'Histoire et de Littérature Religieuse,* 1896, p. 544; 1906, pp. 476 sq.; and in the *Revue du Clergé Français,* 1904, pp. 604-611.

With the coming of the hot season in May, the cardinals, one after the other, requested leave of absence "for reasons of health." Not long after, they all met by previous agreement at Anagni, where they were encouraged in their resistance by the arrival of 200 Gascon and Navarian lances under the command of the famous Bernardon de la Salle, an old companion of Duguesclin.

---

[8] Pastor, I, p. 121; Lindner, *Urban VI,* pp. 411 sq.

[9] For other acts of this sort, see Hefele, X, pp. 39–41.

[10] Muratori, III, part 2, p. 725.

These cardinals had no right to depose the Pope. But might they not pass judgment on the validity of his election? They remembered that it had taken place under the pressure of a tumult. Several even recalled, or pretended to recall, that Prignano's election had not been seriously intended by them. They said that they had simply wished to disarm the fury of the mob by pretending to elect an Italian. On August 9th, 1378, a manifesto issued by these cardinals announced to the world that the election of Urban VI was tainted and that the Holy See was actually vacant. A message from the King of France, which they received on September 18th, induced them to go a step farther.[11] Two days later a second collective letter of the Sacred College informed Christendom that the conclave had chosen Cardinal Robert of Geneva, who took the name of Clement VII. The Great Schism had begun.

Beginning of the Schism

Italian chroniclers are very severe in their judgment of Cardinal Robert of Geneva, for they do not forgive him the expedition which, under Gregory XI, he led against the rebellious Florentines and the horrible massacre of Cesena which took place by his orders in February, 1377. Yet he was not without those qualities which make a great political leader; as for his private conduct, only his enemies find it blameworthy.

---

[11] This letter, which was written by the King's hand, but the text of which has not come down to us, seems to have exercised a decisive influence on the minds of the cardinals. (Valois, I, p. 101; Baudrillart, *Bulletin Critique*, 1896, p. 151.) It is possible greatly to attenuate the moral responsibility of Charles V, who was ill-informed and whose conscience felt secure, resting on the authority of the Sacred College. But history must pass a less favorable judgment on the conscience of Jean de la Grange, the cardinal of Amiens and the King's confidant, and especially that of Urban VI's envoy to the King of France, Pierre de Murles, whose treachery has been discovered and analysed by Valois (I, pp. 90–93).

He was somewhat lame and squint-eyed, but young, enthusiastic, of noble stature and with features that marked him as a man of illustrious race. He was related to most of the sovereigns of Europe. Up to this time, it is true, war and art had engaged his attention more than Church questions, but after the election of Urban VI he became the very soul of the dissident movement and was marked out, by his qualities as well as by his defects, to become the leader of the schismatic party.[12]

From that time Europe was divided into two *"obediences,"* determined in general by the diplomatic relations of the different nations. Spain, Scotland, and lower Italy followed France in supporting Clement VII; England, the greater part of Germany, Hungary, Poland, Denmark, Sweden, Norway, central and northern Italy remained faithful to Urban VI. While the most learned theologians of the time, such as Pierre d'Ailly, Gerson, Henry of Langenstein, Conrad of Gelnhausen, Philippe de Maizières, and Dietrich von Nieheim were divided on the question, the two claimants to headship of the Universal Church excommunicated each other and their respective followers. Saints flourished in both obediences: St. Catherine of Siena, St. Catherine of Sweden, and Blessed Peter of Aragon on the side of the popes of Rome; St. Vincent Ferrer, Blessed Peter of Luxemburg, and St. Collette in the Avignon party. Urban VI's position seemed to be established. But the most incredible failings compromised it. "For some years before his death," says one historian, "Urban had no more cruel enemy of his cause than himself." [13] Unblushing nepotism,[14] unprecedented arbitrariness, deeds of violence that we can hardly believe in spite of the detailed circumstances recorded by the chroniclers, darkened the latter part of his pontificate. Nothing equals the sad excesses of his expedition against Joanna of Naples. That queen, on whom there rested the weightiest suspicions for the murder of her husband, Andrew of Hungary, had declared for the pope of Avignon. Urban excommunicated her, declared her deprived of her throne, and had a crusade preached against her. Its direction he entrusted to the unworthy Charles of Durazzo, who seized the aged queen and had her mysteriously put to death.[15] Then, as Clement VII sent against Charles of Durazzo a pretender of his own choice, Louis of Anjou, Urban himself marched upon Naples behind a band of mercenary soldiers and pillagers. One would have supposed he had gone mad.[16] Soon he was mortally embroiled with Charles, who laid siege to him in Nocera and put a price on his head. According to the chroniclers of the time, Urban took revenge by atrociously executing six cardinals guilty of conspiring against him.[17]

---

[12] By these words we nowise intend to qualify with a theological note the mass of the faithful who in good faith rallied to the obedience of Clement VII and his successor. From this point of view one might rightly say that the Western Schism was not a real schism. In the division which then took place among the faithful, there was not so much a disobedience to, as an error concerning the person of, the veritable Pastor. (On this point see Bouix, *De papa*, I, p. 461; Salembier, *op. cit.*, pp. 49, 50, 180 sqq.; Didiot, *Logique surnaturelle objective*, no. 823). Hence it follows that during the schism the Church was not deprived of the sacraments, as the two popes enjoyed what canon law calls a *titulus coloratus*.

Was it possible that such a sovereign was the legitimate father of the faithful? On all sides men asked themselves this question. Two of Urban's cardinals left him and passed over to Avignon. No longer is it merely the pope's personal authority that suffers from these deplorable excesses, it is the very authority of the supreme pontificate, the notion of which now becomes unsettled in the minds of the faithful. Did Christ build His Church on Peter alone? Was not the foundation broader than that? The most serious and devout men, as Pierre d'Ailly and Jean Gerson, were in doubt, and they concluded that the subordination of the Church to the pope had been until then an accidental and contingent fact, necessitated by historic circumstances, but that the essential constitution of the Church rested on a broader and firmer basis, namely, the infallible authority of the whole body of the faithful represented in council. Thus was elaborated the conciliar theory which the Council of Constance later attempted to make prevail.

---

[13] Salembier, p. 106.

[14] Pastor, I, p. 136.

[15] Valois, II, p. 51.

[16] "Certain acts of Urban VI can, we think, be explained only by supposing a condition bordering on mental alienation." Baudrillart, *Bulletin Critique,* 1896, p. 147.

[17] Dietrich von Nieheim relates that these six cardinals were placed in chains. Vinegar and lime were put into the nose or mouth of some of them, pieces of pointed rushes were driven under their finger nails, cords were tightened around their temples. When Urban VI escaped from Nocera, under the protection of some freebooters, he took his prisoners with him, tied to the backs of horses and exposed bareheaded to the midsummer sun. (Von Nieheim, *De scismate,* pp. 67–69, 76–84, 92–95; Valois, II, pp. 113 sq.; Salembier, p. 106.) Valois has shown that the accounts of the five chroniclers who narrate the expedition of Louis of Anjou to Naples are full of errors. But it is difficult to call in question the fact of the cruelties which Urban VI practiced upon his cardinals.

Another grave consequence resulted from the situation. The reform of the Church, the first aim of Urban VI, became impossible. Abuses spread and the bounty with which both popes gratified their followers multiplied these abuses infinitely.[18] The financial exactions to which the two competitors had recourse to meet the expenses of their strife, exasperated public opinion.[19] To escape an odious tyranny, adventurous spirits began to think of an unlimited freedom of soul, exceeding the transcendental idealism of Joachim of Flora and John of Parma. The new inspiration was to a freedom from all external discipline and all dogma. "The acts of martyrdom of the Fraticelli, recently published by Denifle, sufficiently satisfy us," writes a recent historian, "as to the hopes of these independent Christians who were scattered throughout Italy. They are tired of the haughty government of Rome. . . . What they ask is to be able to pray as they like, on the plains of Latium, in the highlands of Calabria, without church, without priest, and without liturgy. . . . They dream of an utterly simple Christianity, an eternal *Pater noster* uttered far from cities, in the peaceful quiet of the hills, in the trembling light of the stars." [20] The danger was so much the greater since, according to the same author, "the leaven of heresy, which was then spreading north of the Alps, the preaching of Wyclif, the semi-Islamism of the Beghards of Hungary, the theism of the Dalmatian Patarins, the indecent mysticism of the Adamites of Paris, was a most seductive example for a country that had not forgotten the revolts of Segarelli of Parma and Dolcino de Novare or the recent theory in accordance with which Marsilius of Padua stripped the Church of her earthly kingdom." [21]

---

[18] Pastor, I, p. 141.

[19] See de Lesquen and Mollat, *Mesures fiscales exercées en Bretagne par les papes d'Avignon, pendant le grand schisme d'occident.*

Urban VI died October 15th, 1389, and was mourned by no one. Clement VII followed him to the grave five years later. The schism would have ended if the cardinals of either pope had been willing, at his death, to elect his rival. But they did nothing of the sort. In the see of Rome, Urban VI was succeeded by Boniface IX (1389–1404), Innocent VII (1404–1406), and Gregory XII (1406–1417); at Avignon, Clement VII was followed by Benedict XIII, who, to his very death, resisted every solicitation of men and events with immovable obstinacy (1394–1422).

We will not follow the series of conflicts between the two obediences, negotiations twenty times resumed and as frequently broken off. They can be found in special works.[22] Boniface IX [23] was much engaged in reconstructing the papal finances; but he irritated the people by his exactions. Innocent VII,[24] who was devoted to the pursuit of science and literature, announced by a solemn Bull the restoration of the Roman University founded by Boniface VIII; but he died shortly afterwards, and one of the saddest results of his short pontificate was the introduction of pagan humanism at the papal court in the person of Poggio. Gregory XII,[25] elected because of his peaceful disposition, did nothing for the union, which he appeared to avoid as much as did his competitor. By this attitude he provoked the most abusive pamphlets against him and—a thing unheard-of until then—he alienated from his person at one time seven cardinals, who placed themselves under the Avignon obedience. Thus each of these popes, although their intentions cannot be blamed, seemed in fact to work against the much desired reunion.

---

[20] Gebhart in *Revue des Deux Mondes*, XCV (1889), p. 142.

[21] *Ibid.*, p. 143.

[22] Valois, *op. cit.;* Salembier, *op. cit.*

[23] Boniface IX, Pierre Tomacelli, belonged to a noble but impoverished family of Naples. He was tall, affable, and pure.

Benedict XIII of Avignon

Benedict XIII, whom the cardinals of the Avignon obedience elected (Sept. 28th, 1394) to succeed Clement VII, was that Pedro de Luna whom we saw exercising a predominant influence, along with Robert of Geneva, at the time of Urban's election. Like his adversaries, the popes of Rome, he offered history not the least pretext to question the purity of his morals or the loftiness of his mind.

"Short, thin, about sixty-six years old, the man who by his merit or cleverness was raised to the doubtful post left vacant by the death of Clement VII, was not," says Noël Valois, "the common hypocrite that his adversaries have asserted. His noble birth (he belonged to one of the most aristocratic families of

---

[24] From his family name, he was called Cosmato Nigliorati of Sulmone. His learning and virtues have been much praised.

[25] Angelo Corrario of Venice, a venerable old man, known for his great integrity.

Aragon), his legal knowledge, acquired by a long professorship of canon law at Montpellier, and his irreproachable purity of character had early marked him for the choice of Gregory XI. The pains he took to inform himself and his slowness in taking sides at the beginning of the schism indicated a delicate conscience. During the pontificate of Clement VII he showed himself a vigorous polemic, an inventive politician, and a successful diplomat. His embassies to Castile, Aragon, and Navarre were a triumph for him no less than for the Avignon pope. This thoroughly ecclesiastical spirit sinned only by the excess of his qualities: his ability at times degenerated into craftiness; his unbending energy became obstinacy; his personal dignity and taste for independence led to intractable pride."[26]

Like all the popes of Rome, Benedict XIII at the time of his election promised to do his utmost to bring about the union. During the conclave, when his colleagues spoke of the possible necessity of abdicating in the interest of peace, Pedro de Luna said: "What of it? For my part I would as readily abdicate the power as take off my cope."[27] It was not foreseen that, as Benedict XIII, he would lay down conditions for his abdication which would never be accepted. For thirty years he lived in strife with the Roman pope, then with the Council of Constance, and finally with his own followers, and tried to prolong the schism after his death by exacting from the three cardinals who remained faithful to his cause a promise to elect a successor to himself.

The University of Paris, which, because of the excellence of its teaching and the great men then at its head—Pierre d'Ailly, Jean Gerson, and Nicholas de Clemanges—enjoyed a considerable influence throughout Europe, now initiated an extensive campaign for peace. Notwithstanding the repeated injunctions of King Charles V, it had been slow in submitting to the obedience of Clement VII.[28] In 1390, by a solemn remonstrance addressed to King Charles VI, it attempted to intervene with a view to healing the schism. But this effort remained barren.[29] The result was happier in 1394. It instituted a vast inquiry as to the proper means for putting an end to the schism; no less than ten thousand ballots [30] were turned in, suggesting three different methods: the simultaneous resignation of the two popes, arbitration by mutual consent, and a decision of the Church assembled in general council. In 1395 a national council, meeting at Paris under the auspices of the University, decided upon the first method, called the "way of cession." An embassy was commissioned to notify Benedict XIII of the result, both in the name of the assembly and that of the King of France and to beg him to yield for the sake of peace.

---

[26] Valois, III, pp. 16 sq.

[27] Du Chastenet, *Nouvelle histoire du concile de Constance,* Preuves, p. 107; Le Couteulx, *Annales ordinis carthusiensis,* VI, p. 65.

Was the jealous susceptibility of the autocratic Benedict XIII offended by the authoritative, impatient, and almost threatening tone of the letters from the University of Paris? After a few dilatory replies, he answered that the way of cession was not admissible in law, that the tradition of the Church did not favor it, and that the only possible method was by a conference with his rival in some safe place. In vain did the King of France implore him by means of special envoys; in vain did the cardinals add their urgent petitions to those of the royal embassy; in vain did Pierre d'Ailly, after patient and astute negotiations, win over Wenceslaus, king of the Romans, to the method of cession. To all these entreaties the Avignon Pope replied that he believed he would be guilty of mortal sin if he employed this method. It is true that the Pope of Rome was, on his side, no more disposed to accept the proposals of the kings of France and Germany.[31]

---

[28] Féret, *La faculté de théologie de Paris,* III, pp. 97–103.

[29] *Ibid.,* p. 104.

[30] *Ibid.,* p. 105.

The University of Paris was cruelly disappointed. For some time another plan had been coming to light: no longer to recognize the pope who was false to the promise he made at his consecration, and to withdraw from his obedience. After long deliberation, a national council, held at Paris, voted, at a session held in July, 1398, the withdrawal of obedience. The council's decision, promulgated by the King, was brought to Benedict XIII by Pierre d'Ailly and forcibly supported by the condottiere Geoffrey de Boucicaut, who besieged Avignon for four years and kept the Pope a prisoner in his palace.

From that time St. Vincent Ferrer and seventeen cardinals abandoned the cause of Benedict XIII. On the other hand, the University of Paris, considering that a resignation obtained by force would be valueless and, moreover, despairing of overcoming the obstinacy of Pedro de Luna, resorted to another method of pacification: the calling of an ecumenical council. On September 1st, 1403, the University notified the Pope of the restitution of obedience, which was voted the preceding May on the proposal of the French king. But as a condition of this restitution, it required the summoning of a council by the Pope within a year. Benedict XIII's character, however, was not calculated to give them much hope that he would take this step. Consequently there arose the idea of summoning a council regardless of the wishes of the two popes. For some time past this plan had been preached in Germany. Conrad of Gelnhausen, formerly a student of theology at Paris and at this time chancellor of the new University of Heidelberg, became its chief promoter. Henry of Langenstein, also educated at the Paris University, made himself its earnest defender and profound theorist. In a treatise entitled *Consilium pacis de unione ac reformatione Ecclesiae in Concilio universali quaerendae* (1381), Langenstein declared that in his eyes the schism was an evil that had happened with the permission of Providence to bring about the reform of the Church. His reform programme consisted in assigning preëminence to general councils, to the loss of papal authority.

---

[31] "Certainly," he said, "neither because of treaties nor because of words of the kings of France and Germany, will I submit to their will." (Froissart, XVI, pp. 86, 117.)

Langenstein was a lawyer, a mathematician, an eminent economist,[32] as well as a renowned theologian. In defending his project, he employed all the resources of an acute mind and a vast knowledge. Starting out from the pretended principle that the constitution of the Church ought to be judged by the same rules as the constitution of any society, and also noting that every law should be interpreted in relation to the purpose it is intended to attain, and that the purpose of ecclesiastical society is the good order and peace of the Christian world, this jurist-theologian concluded that the institution of the papacy by Christ should not be exaggerated. Providential events showed that the only way of assuring order in the Church was to recognize the supremacy of a council summoned by the emperor. The Church, to which alone Christ said that the powers of hell should not prevail against her, would find therein her essential constitution.

January 1st, 1404, four months after the restitution of obedience on the part of France to Benedict XIII,[33] Jean Gerson, chancellor of the University of Paris, while preaching before the Avignon Pope at Tarascon, developed ideas that were almost equally radical. The schism must cease, he said in substance. The purpose of the Church is order and peace. The pope does not suffice to obtain this end. Every other necessary means must be considered legitimate. But there remains only one means: the meeting of a universal council.[34]

---

[32] See Janssen, *History of the German People at the Close of the Middle Ages,* II, 95.

[33] Valois, III, p. 417.

The man who spoke thus was reputed among the most eminent members of the French clergy. Jean Charlier, better known as Gerson, who was to play a predominant part in the councils of Pisa and Constance, was born in the village of Gerson, diocese of Rheims, November 14th, 1363,[35] in a family of very humble station. By hard studying at the College of Rheims, then at the College of Navarre, he soon reached the highest dignities. As chancellor of the University of Paris, in 1395, he so distinguished himself that, according to the expression of Launoy, "he made of this word 'chancellor' a sort of proper noun." He was an administrator, diplomat, scholar, polemic, mystic. In 1403 he published his *Lettre aux étudiants sur la réforme de la théologie* and perhaps the *Mendicité spirituelle* or *Parlement sécret de l'homme avec son âme,* "the reputation of which would have rivaled that of the *Imitation,*" says Paulin Paris, "if it had been as widely read." [36]

Such was the man who, following the most renowned theologian of Germany, found as a remedy for the powerlessness of the popes only a theory that was subversive of the constitution of the Church; so greatly had the sad events of this period disturbed the finest minds.

As for the people, who could not rise to such lofty speculations, they wondered if they were not soon to witness the end of the world. Had not premonitory signs already appeared? Naturally the followers of Benedict XIII saw the Antichrist in the pope of Rome, as those of Innocent VIII saw him in the Avignon pope. The strangest prophecies were credited.[37] In England, Wyclif's disciples, under the name of "poor priests," spread the heresiarch's doctrines. It was recalled that, at the beginning of the schism, the fiery professor in a booklet entitled *De Papa romano* had said: "Now is the propitious time: let the Emperor and the kings claim the inheritance of the Church!" In 1380 and 1381, while Conrad of Gelnhausen and Henry of Langenstein in Germany attacked the Church in its hierarchy, Wyclif tried to ruin it in its most essential dogmas. "Let each one of the faithful," he wrote in his *Prospeculum,* "draw his doctrine from the reading of the Bible: there you will find a purer and more complete faith than in all the commentaries and teachings of prelates." But it was especially in his *Trialogus,* written the year before his death (1383), that Wyclif published his most revolutionary doctrines, namely, "that the effects of the Sacraments are due only to the merits of the persons receiving them; that every superior, whether civil or religious, is deprived of his authority by the fact of being in the state of mortal sin; that everything happens by necessity; that the notion we entertain of our freedom of action is a perpetual illusion; that the Church certainly exists somewhere, but may be reduced to a few poor laymen scattered in different countries." [38]

---

[34] Gersonius, *Opera,* II, pp. 54–73.

[35] Féret, *op. cit.,* IV, p. 224.

[36] Paris, *Les manuscrits français,* II, pp. 115–117. It is well known that some authors have attributed the *Imitation of Christ* to Gerson.

[37] Cf. Pastor, I, pp. 151 sq.

After Wyclif's death, his disciples, the "poor priests," became mingled with the heretical sect of the Lollards, whose origin is not well known and who denied the right of individual ownership. Then the government took alarm. In 1395, after the Lollards had affixed placards to the doors of Westminster and St. Paul's defaming the clergy, a national council assembled in London and condemned eighteen propositions taken from the *Trialogus.* On May 10th, 1401, William Samtre, a London priest, having been convicted of teaching Wyclif's doctrines, was burned at the stake in the presence of an immense throng. For a time in England the energy of the repression shattered the combined doctrines of the Wyclifites and Lollards. But they soon came to life again on the continent with John Hus.

---

[38] On Wyclif's doctrines, see Bossuet, *Variations,* bk. 11, nos. 153–160; Pastor, I, pp. 159 sq.; Denzinger, nos. 581–625; Trésal, *op. cit.,* pp. 6–14.

The Saints and the Schism

In the midst of this culpable alteration of dogmas, this obscuring of the principles of the hierarchical government of the Church, this confusion of consciences, the historian is tempted to ask himself, where was the truly Catholic spirit?

First of all it was in the saints. As we have seen, God failed not to raise them up in both obediences. St. Catherine of Siena illumined the beginnings of this dark period by the wisdom of her advice no less than by the loftiness of her ecstasies. Until her death, in 1380, she continued to address popes, kings, lords, and peoples with a message of justice and peace. She witnessed Urban VI's election and never doubted its validity. On the morrow of the election of Robert of Geneva, she wrote to the Pope of Rome: "They have chosen, not a vicar of Jesus Christ, but an Antichrist; never will I cease to behold in you, beloved father, the vicar of Jesus Christ on earth. Take courage, then, Holy Father, enter the strife without fear." But when she sees the Pope undertaking the work of reform with means so far from evangelical, she utters a courageous protest: "Carry out your task with moderation, not without measure. . . . For the love of Christ crucified, temper those sudden outbursts prompted by your natural disposition." [39] "Justice without mercy is no longer justice, but rather injustice."

When the division of the two obediences was consummated, Catherine's soul was filled with grief and she expressed her feelings to a certain nun in these words: "Each epoch has its anguish, but neither you nor anyone else ever saw a time so troubled as this. Look and your soul will be overwhelmed with pain and bitterness, you will see the dark shadows that have spread over the Church . . . It is the time to watch and not to sleep; it is the time to overcome the enemy by prayer, tears, labor, loving desires, and unceasing supplication." [40] Yet Catherine never feared for the Church. At the most grievous period of the strife she said: "I see that this Spouse of Christ is the dispenser of life because she has within herself such vitality that no one can kill her . . . I see that her fecundity never diminishes, but ever increases." [41] Catherine died without the happiness of seeing peace restored to the Church, but, at the very last, she thus addressed those gathered about her death-bed: "Remain faithful to Urban VI, for he is the true Pope."

---

[39] Tommaseo, IV, pp. 64, 442 sq.; Hase, p. 253.

Blessed Peter of Aragon, a prince of royal blood, entered the Order of St. Francis in his youth; he was supposed to be favored with heavenly visions, ecstasies, and prophecies. His relationship to several princely families enabled him to remind the great ones of their duty to rally about the Roman pope.

But God lavished His precious graces also in the Avignon obedience, which embraced many of the faithful, who defended the cause of Clement VII and Benedict XIII so obstinately only because they thought it their duty thus to uphold the unity of the Church and its hierarchy. Models of holiness abounded among them. There was the young Cardinal Peter of Luxemburg, "the St. Aloysius Gonzaga of the fourteenth century," who died at the age of eighteen, after a life of angelic purity and sweetness; [42] there was the earnest missioner and thaumaturge, St. Vincent Ferrer, whose words and virtues performed miracles of conversion; [43] there was the humble St. Colette, who, like St. Teresa, reformed a great religious Order.[44] St. Vincent Ferrer and St. Colette at length withdrew from the obstinate Benedict XIII; but Blessed Peter of Luxemburg died without expressing the slightest doubt as to the legitimacy of the Avignon pope.

---

[40] Tommaseo, IV, p. 143.

[41] Capecelatro, pp. 242 sq.

[42] *Acta sanctorum*, July, I, pp. 428, 483.

[43] Fages, *Histoire de saint Vincent Ferrier.*

This mysterious economy of divine grace can in no way disturb a Christian's faith. Amidst the agitations of the schism, St. Vincent Ferrer very justly wrote: "We should not decide the legitimacy of the popes by means of prophecies or miracles or visions. The Christian people are governed by laws against which extraordinary events count nothing." [45] In other words, miracles and other spiritual favors could be granted to reward individual faith and to edify the Christian people, without serving as proofs of any pope's legitimacy. No conclusion can rightly be drawn from them in favor of either claimant to the papacy.

At this epoch we meet with the Christian spirit not merely in individual souls; it was also manifested in a great ecclesiastical institution which was destined, after doing much for the renewal of Christian life, to give the world in that sad fourteenth century, so dark and disturbed, the sweetest and "most beautiful book that ever came from the hand of man, since the Gospel comes from God"—the *Imitation of Christ*. We are referring to the "Brethren of the Common Life," founded by the Venerable Gerard Groote (1340–1384). Salembier says: "A fervidly eloquent preacher, he [Gerard] was the Vincent Ferrer of Holland and the North of Germany; as a reformer of the clergy, he is a forerunner of the mission of St. Vincent de Paul; as an educator of the young, he gives up his whole life to them like Joseph Calasanctius; as the founder of an Order, he is the father of the Brothers of the Common

---

[44] Douillet, *Sainte Colette;* Comte de Chamberet, *Vie de sainte Colette.*

[45] *De moderno ecclesiae schismate,* Bibl. nat., no. 1470; cited by Valois, I, p. 222.

Life, a congregation which was very popular in our part of the world; he was the St. John de la Salle of the fourteenth century." [46]

The Brethren of the Common Life, who later (1395) adopted the rule of St. Augustine and established the center of their activities at Windesheim, at first held an intermediate position between the existing congregations and the secular clergy. They took no vows and asked nothing from the charity of the faithful. Each house had to be self-supporting by the labor of the brethren, who educated children and copied manuscripts. Thomas à Kempis has left us a charming portrait of the life led in these pious asylums. "Lowliness," he says, "which therein was the chief of all virtues, was sought after by all from the lowest to the highest, and did make a paradise of this earthly house, transforming mortal men into heavenly pearls to be as living stones meet for glory in the temple of God. Here obedience, the mother of virtue, . . . flourished . . . Here the inward manifestations of love, that is for God, and its outward manifestation, that is charity to one's neighbor, burned with so hot a flame that the hard hearts of sinners who heard the holy discourses of the Brothers were melted to tears, and they that had come thither cold at heart, being there kindled by the fire of the Word, went away rejoicing, heedful to sin no more . . . Here the memory of the ancient Fathers was restored to life, and the manner of life of the clergy rose to that standard of the highest perfection which was set by the practice of the Primitive Church." [47]

It has been said that Gerard Groote's work can be summed up in a single phrase: the imitation of Christ.[48] This, in fact, was the title given a collection of maxims by which the brethren lived. The most probable hypothesis is that its origin must be referred to those collections or *rapiaria* of maxims, prayers, aspirations, and colloquies which were gathered by the different houses then dependent on Windesheim. The four books of the *Imitation* would accordingly be merely the *rapiarium* of a man of genius, possibly that Thomas à Kempis who, as we remarked above, so exalted the life and virtues of Gerard Groote's spiritual sons.[49]

---

[46] Salembier, p. 77.

[47] Thomas à Kempis, *The Founders of the New Devotion* (*Works*, II, ch. 21.)

[48] Pastor, I, pp. 147 sq.

This choice company of saints and pious persons kept up the pure Catholic spirit in the Church. Attachment to the unity of the Church and to the pope was also deeply rooted in the masses. "As there is only one God in Heaven," said Froissart, "so there can and should be only one pope on earth."

The theologians gave voice to courageous protests. "In the Assembly held in Paris in 1406, where Guillaume Filastre, the future cardinal, absolutely denied the right of a general council to judge or condemn the pope, Pierre d'Ailly lamented the manner in which certain members of the University of Paris spoke of the Pope." [50]

But the idea of a council was launched and gained favor. The cardinals of both obediences adopted a plan to take the direction of the Church into their own hands and to call a council. The project was approved by the universities of Paris, Oxford, and Bologna. These universities took their stand on the natural and divine right which the Church must have of finding within herself the means of reëstablishing her unity.[51] Reduced, in its application, to the case of absolute necessity, this right of the Church was, indeed, undeniable. But it was requisite that the cardinals' titles should be incontestable and that the council summoned by them should be regularly constituted. The very incomplete realization of these two conditions would not only deprive the future council of its ecumenical character, but would also cast grave doubts on the validity of its disciplinary decisions. "If the cardinals doubt the legitimacy of their pope," said Carlo Malatesta, prince of Rimini, "why do they not question the legitimacy of the powers which they hold from him?" [52] He was fearful that the council "assembled to establish unity, would end in a trinity." The event showed he was right.

---

[49] This is the hypothesis accepted by Vacandard in the *Revue du Clergé Français*, December 15th, 1908, pp. 663 sq.; Spitzen, *Nouvelle défense de Thomas à Kempis; Les hollandismes de l'Imitation;* Brucker, *Thomas à Kempis et l'Imitation de Jésus-Christ, nouveaux documents,* in *Études*, May 5th, 1914, pp. 366–369. Cf. Puyol, *L'auteur du livre de Imitatione Christi;* Funck, *Gerson und Gersen;* Malou, *Recherches historiques et critiques sur le veritable auteur de l'Imitation;* Duchesne in the *Bulletin Critique*, 1889, p. 228; Denifle, *Kritische Bemerkungen zur Gerson-Kempis-Frage;* Loth, *L'auteur de l'Imitation,* in the *Revue des questions historiques,* 1873.

[50] Pastor, I, p. 185.

[51] Martène and Durand, VII, cols. 894, 898.

The Council of Pisa

The pseudo-council summoned to Pisa by the cardinals,[53] against the express opposition not only of Benedict XIII, but also of Gregory XII, the Pope of Rome, could not expect to be considered the organ of the universal Church, since several nations were not represented at it. It met on March 25th, 1409, and, at its best attended sessions, counted 24 cardinals, 80 bishops, 102 procurators of absent bishops, and a large number of ecclesiastics, among whom were 300 theologians.[54] The solemn procession by which the assembly celebrated its opening and the title of "ecumenical" which it assumed could not give it the authority needed to have its decisions obeyed by the Christian nations, and especially by the two popes. The violent, excessive, and precipitate manner in which it proceeded compromised what little prestige it had.

---

[52] *"Si de papa dubitant, cur non de cardinalatu?"* On Malatesta, who was one of the finest characters of that time, and on his political rôle, see Hefele, X, pp. 179 sq., 307 sq., and *passim*.

[53] Fourteen cardinals of the Roman and ten of the Avignon obedience.

[54] A list of the members of the Council in d'Achery, *Spicilegium*, I, p. 853.

The Council of Pisa was under the leadership of a clever intriguer, as familiar with worldly affairs as he seemed a stranger to the affairs of God,[55] namely, Cardinal Balthasar Cossa, who was accused, though probably unjustly, of having sailed the Sicilian seas on a pirate ship in his youth.[56] By a decree that was without precedent in conciliar tradition, the assembly decided that the votes should be counted by nations and not individually; then, by a condemnation equally novel in the history of the Church, it declared Benedict XIII and Gregory XII deprived of the supreme pontificate as being heretics: they had, said the council, violated the article of the Creed, *"Credo in Ecclesiam . . . unam."* This decision was as unjust as it was illegal.

After promising to take steps for the reform of the Church "in its head and members," the Council of Pisa crowned its work in a decision that, "by commission of the council," the cardinals should elect a new pope. Less precipitation might have saved everything. At that very moment, the ambassadors of the king of Aragon were bringing to the patriarch of Alexandria a document authorizing them to announce the unconditional abdication of Benedict XIII. At the same time, the King of France wrote to his cardinals, begging them not to hasten the election too much.

When the letter of the French King arrived (June 26th, 1409) and when an embassy from the king of Castile presented itself for an audience, it was too late. The influence of Balthasar Cossa had just brought about the election of a peaceful, feeble old man of seventy years, Pierre Philargis, who took the name of Alexander V.[57] In place of two popes, Christendom now counted three.

---

[55] St. Antoninus says: *"Vir in temporalibus magnus, in spiritualibus nullus omnino atque ineptus."* (*Summa historialis,* part 3, tit. 22, ch. 6.)

[56] This accusation is made by Dietrich von Nieheim. It seems to be a calumny. Cf. Platina, *De vitis pontificum,* p. 248, and the *Chronique de Saint-Denis* (reign of Charles VI), bk. 33, ch. 28.

Alexander V

Alexander V was born on the Greek island of Candia, of very poor parents, who abandoned him in his childhood. The young boy was begging his bread along the highways when he met an Italian Friar Minor, who was struck by his natural gifts of intelligence and docility and had him received into his monastery. A brilliant course of studies at Oxford and Paris won him a chair of philosophy in the latter city, where he acquired great prestige as a scholar and an orator. But his firmness of character did not reach the level of his gifts of mind; and Balthasar Cossa, precisely because he found this defect in Philargis, thrust him into the papacy, hoping thus to govern the Church in his name.[58]

His expectation came true. Alexander, through timidity, gratitude, or weakness, remained under the sway of his legate, Balthasar Cossa. He entered Rome in triumph with the troops of Louis II of Anjou as a result of Cossa's diplomacy and "belligerent coöperation";[59] he subsequently retired to Bologna because Cossa thus decided;[60] he distributed benefices and privileges with excessive lavishness, particularly in favor of his friends and those of Cossa. His pontificate, however, lasted but a short time. After presiding over the destinies of the Church for ten months and a few days, Alexander V drew his last breath on May 3rd, 1410, recommending peace and concord to his cardinals. Fourteen days later, these cardinals gave him a successor in the person of Balthasar Cossa himself. He was ordained priest May 24th, and consecrated and crowned the day following. He took the name of John XXIII.

---

[57] "It was especially Balthasar Cossa who brought about that election," says Hefele (X, p. 292), who founds his view on various contemporary testimonies. Cf. Martène, *Vet. script.*, VI, p. 1115; Von Nieheim, *De scismate,* bk. 3, p. 51; Platina, *op. cit.*, in *Vita Alexandri V* (*The Lives of the Popes,* p. 341). What are we to think of the legitimacy of this election? Pastor (I, p. 191) and Hergenröther (IV, p. 534) consider it altogether null, as the Council of Pisa had been convoked neither by the entire Church nor by the legitimate pope. There are many, however, who consider Alexander V a true pope. In fact, the majority of the Church rallied to him. As to the right which a regular council would have in the case of a heretical pope or a doubtful pope, see Mazzella, *De vera religione et de Ecclesia Christi,* pp. 477, 818. On the character of the Council of Pisa, see Bellarmine, *De conciliis et Ecclesia,* II, chap. 8.

[58] Hefele (X, p. 293) notes another defect of Philargis, which might have made Cossa hope to use him as a tool: "He did not despise the comforts of life, and he liked heady wines."

[59] *Ibid.,* p. 295.

John XXIII

The new Pope was not the monster that certain historians would have us believe. It is quite enough that, during his lifetime and without any vigorous denials on the part of his followers, he could be accused of canvassing for the tiara, of using pressure to obtain the votes of his colleagues,[61] and even of shortening the days of his predecessor.[62] It has been said that John XXIII repeated the brutalities of Robert of Geneva and that he was a worthy precursor to the Borgias;[63] but this is not true. It is also recounted that at the conclave, sending for St. Peter's cloak and putting it on, he said: "It is I who am pope"; but this also is pure legend.[64] Yet it must be confessed that with him the spirit of intrigue and worldliness was enthroned on the chair of Peter. His election was a humiliation for the Church. As if Providence, before giving peace and unity to Christendom, willed that all the evils from which the Church had suffered should be pushed to the extreme, we see in the pontificate of John XXIII the boldest theories of Marsilius of Padua and William of Occam, who had so greatly scandalized the Church, come forth openly in the midst of the Council of Constance, and the most cynical doctrines of Wyclif uttered in the world's most august assembly by the insolent lips of John Hus.

---

[60] *Ibid.*, p. 306.

[61] *Ibid.*, p. 309.

[62] *Ibid.*, p. 307.

[63] See in Hefele (pp. 310–314) the exposition and refutation of these different accusations.

[64] *Ibid.*, p. 309.

It is said that Balthasar Cossa's character seemed to change after his election, that he no longer seemed the same man as before, that no one recognized in him the accomplished statesman whose brilliant qualities had been noted by the chronicler of Charles VI.[65] In fact, this clever diplomat failed in everything. Perhaps it is ordained that, in a supernatural work like that of the Church, human talents should fail and turn against him who relies upon them.

The assembly of Pisa decreed that a new council should meet three years later. In 1412, John XXIII decided to convoke it in Rome. But the members involved themselves in well-nigh fruitless preliminaries. Nicholas of Clemangis relates that at the first two sessions, just when they were about to invoke the Holy Ghost, an owl suddenly flew in front of the Pope and that it was with difficulty driven away with a club.[66] In short, on March 3rd, 1413, John proclaimed the dissolution of the assembly and the convoking of another council for the month of December; its meeting-place was to be determined later. This gave Ladislas, king of Naples, who had just made an alliance with the Pope, an occasion to break off the alliance abruptly and to pillage Rome, while John promptly took to flight.[67]

---

[65] *Chronique de Saint-Denis* (reign of Charles VI), bk. 31, chap. 1.

[66] Von Nieheim also speaks of this owl. (Hefele, X, p. 320.) Whether the event was real or legendary, it gives us the impression produced by John XXIII in this council.

[67] Raynaldi, 1413, no. 1. Gregorovius, *History of the City of Rome in the Middle Ages,* VI, pp. 625 sqq.

The unfortunate Pontiff invoked the all-powerful support of Emperor Sigismond. Besides being the born defender of the Church by virtue of his imperial title, Sigismond was by his personal qualities the worthy and energetic leader towards whom Christians instinctively turned with confidence when the papacy became discredited. He answered the appeal and, in the active zeal which he displayed in defending the unity of the Church, if he sometimes exceeded the limits of his rights, he ever displayed the noblest and most upright intentions.

On October 30th, 1413, the Emperor announced that a general council would open at Constance on November 1st of the following year. He invited Gregory XII, Benedict XIII, and all Christian princes to be present. On December 9th, John XXIII issued the official Bull of convocation and, while a republic was proclaimed at Rome, which he had abandoned, he was actively engaged with the preliminaries of the future assembly. No doubt he hoped, thanks to this initiative, to be recognized without dispute by the assembly over which he would preside, to the exclusion of his two competitors. But, as the time for the council drew near, his confidence weakened. Stories are told, showing him on his way to Constance, swearing in the devil's name and, upon reaching the shores of the lake, crying out contemptuously: "It is here the foxes are going to be caught." [68] These narratives lack authenticity, but they well express the feelings this Pope must have experienced as the council drew near.

The Council of Constance

The opening ceremonies of the Council of Constance were splendid. The Pope's solemn entry into the cathedral was triumphal. "A general council in Germany," says Hefele, the great historian of the councils, "the first council ever to assemble there, was a sight so prodigious and extraordinary that thousands of men gathered there from all the States and, following the pompous custom of the times, each one with the largest following he could collect, some to gratify their curiosity, others to shine, to meet their friends, or to transact their business. Besides, desire of gain had drawn to Constance a large number of merchants, artisans, workmen, as well as actors, adventurers, musicians, and even harlots." [69] Gathered about Emperor Sigismond, and in company with the greatest noblemen of Germany, such as the dukes of Bavaria, Austria, Saxony, Mecklenburg, and Lorraine, could be seen the ambassadors of the kings of France, England, Scotland, Poland, Sweden, Denmark, Norway, Naples, and Sicily. Later came those of the King of Spain and of the Emperor of Constantinople. The number of the members of the council, of foreign princes and nobles,[70] increased notably. At its largest meetings, the council counted 3 patriarchs, 29 cardinals, 33 archbishops, about 150 bishops, more than 100 abbots, and about 300 theologians. Such a gathering, in the midst of such a people, representing the whole of Christendom, if organized hierarchically and canonically, could have become the liberating and pacifying force of the Christian world. By the fault of one and another and by the misfortunes of circumstances, it represented at first only the confusion of ideas and passions that reigned in the world.

---

[68] Hefele, X, pp. 325 sq.

From the very first session it was evident that three men would dominate the assembly by the superiority of their learning and their personal influence: they were Pierre d'Ailly, bishop of Cambrai, Cardinal Zarabella, legate of Pope John XXIII, and Jean Gerson, ambassador of the French King and delegate of the University of Paris.[71] These three illustrious personages, whose austere life equally recommended them to the respect of the council and of the entire Church, were unfortunately imbued with false ideas as to the respective powers of the pope and of the Church. For Pierre d'Ailly, "who often," says Bossuet, "voices the mind of the whole Faculty of Paris," [72] "the subordination of the Church to the pope is only accidental," [73] "the pope can err and even become a heretic," [74] "he can be rebuked, as St. Peter was by St. Paul"; [75] he can be reproved and corrected especially by a universal council, which is superior to him. Does it follow that the council is infallible? Not at all; it is a pious belief, contradicted by the facts, for several general councils have made mistakes.[76] Such were the ideas that Pierre d'Ailly began to set forth from the time he left the schools of the Rue du Fouarre, in 1380.[77] Moreover, by character and temperament, the bishop of Cambrai was always a man of conciliation and compromise.

---

[69] *Ibid.*, p. 392.

[70] Ulrich von Richental, charged with the duty of making a list of the visitors' names, has left it to us. This authentic witness assures us that "there were at Constance at least seven hundred women in the public houses or in their own, without counting those who did not declare themselves." (*Chronik des Constanzer Concils*, f. CCXI.) Hence we may safely conclude that, among so many worldly nobles and men of arms, a certain number were guilty of unworthy conduct. But to use this passage of Richental to attack the morality of the ecclesiastics at the Council of Constance, is manifestly unjust.

In 1408 [78] the learned canonist Zarabella, from scattered ideas in the works and minor writings of Pierre d'Ailly, formed a powerful synthesis which he set forth in his treatise *De jurisdictione imperiali.* For him the pope is merely the first servitor of the Church. If it is right to recognize in him the supreme power in ordinary times, this is because the universal Church cannot always make a decision through itself, nor through a general council, nor through the college of cardinals. Zarabella differs from d'Ailly in that he admits the infallibility of ecumenical councils. If the pope and the cardinals fail to do so, the councils will be convoked by the emperor.[79] This strange legate of a strange pontiff could not give any but a wrong orientation to the future council.

---

[71] According to unpublished documents, analyzed by Noël Valois, Jean Gerson was not the official delegate of the University of Paris, but only an informal representative. (Valois, *op. cit.*, IV, p. 273.)

[72] Bossuet, *Defensio declarationis cleri gallicani,* part 2, bk. 6, chap. 20.

[73] *De ecclesiae conc. gen. et sum. pontificis auctoritate,* in the *Opera Gersonii* (Dupin ed.), II, col. 958.

[74] Gerson, *Opera,* I, col. 689.

[75] *Ibid.,* II, col. 949, 959.

[76] *Ibid.,* II, col. 958.

[77] Salembier, *The Great Schism of the West.* On Pierre d'Ailly, see Salembier, *Petrus de Alliaco.*

[78] This is the date assigned by Pastor, I, p. 187.

In this assembly, with Zarabella as its official head and Pierre d'Ailly as it brightest light,[80] Jean Gerson, a mystical and vibrant spirit, exercised a still more persuasive influence and, it seemed, a more preponderant one on the Council of Constance. He was a disciple of Pierre d'Ailly, but went farther than his master. Like Zarabella, he recognized supreme power in the council; but he wished to admit simple parish priests at the side of the bishops.[81] In the Church universal he wished to make a place for the autonomy of national churches, gathered about the head of the State. Does not the Christian ruler render services to the Church by executing her laws? In case of failure of the papal authority, is it not the Christian ruler who maintains the cohesion of the national churches and thus preserves the force of their apostolate?[82]

The lofty integrity and sincere piety of the men who professed such doctrines, the combination of sad circumstances and events which seemed to justify them, explain the welcome accorded them in the Council. Nevertheless they were revolutionary as regards the headship of the Church, subversive of the ecclesiastical hierarchy, and expressly opposed to all Catholic tradition. Gerson himself admits that his doctrine is a novelty.[83]

---

[79] Zarabella, *De jurisdictione imperiali.*

[80] It is Bossuet's expression, *"Sancti Conventus lumen et in dogmatibus explicandis facile princeps."* (*Defensio declar.*, ch. 30.)

[81] Gerson, *Opera,* II, col. 249, 436.

[82] *Ibid.*, col. 114, 135, and *passim.*

One of the first cares of the assembled bishops was to decide, as proposed by Pierre d'Ailly, that "prelates and abbots having jurisdiction should not alone have a 'definitive' voice, but that doctors of theology, of canon or civil law, would have the same rights." [84] This was to give human science a place which, in the supernatural economy of the Church, can belong only to the divinely constituted hierarchy. This first resolution would have been enough to vitiate the council's authority.

But it went farther: it decreed that, as at Pisa, the voting should be by nations. The representatives of France, England, Germany, and Italy (later also those of Spain) used to meet and take a vote *nationaliter* before presenting a question to the general assembly of the four nations *conciliariter*.[85] Thus to transform questions of universal interest into national questions, was to introduce a new element of trouble into the pretended council.

A strange tactical move on the part of John XXIII soon completed the disorder. The second session had just closed. During the evening of March 20th, 1415, while the princes and nobles were occupying their leisure with a great tournament, no one noticed that a man, disguised as a groom, dressed in poor gray clothes, upon a wretched horse with a cross-bow at the saddle, and concealing his face as well as he could so as not to be recognized, passed through the city and out by one of the gates. It was Pope John XXIII.[86] He went to Schaffhausen and the next day wrote the following note from there to Emperor Sigismond: "I am free and enjoying very good air at Schaffhausen. I take back nothing of the promise that I made to give peace to the Church by resigning my powers."[87] This was a new and contemptible bit of ingenuity on the part of the unworthy Pontiff. Crushed by the council's failure to admit his legitimacy without dispute and by their requiring the resignation of all three popes, himself included, John XXIII hoped to bring about the dissolution of the council by stealing away.

---

[83] *Ibid.*, col. 247.

[84] Mansi, XXVII, p. 560; Hardouin, VIII, p. 223. Cf. Salembier, *Petrus de Alliaco*, p. 274. Pierre d'Ailly had asked that even the princes be given the right of a "definitive" vote. (Gerson, *Opera*, II, col. 941.)

[85] Gerson, *op. cit.*, II, col. 230; V, col. 53.

[86] Hefele, X, p. 393.

But again his plan failed. The Pope's flight merely left the field free for the independence to which the pseudo-council aspired. On March 26th, 1415, the third general session opened under the presidency of Pierre d'Ailly. The delegates declared that they remained faithful to the obedience of Pope John in spite of his flight, with the explicit reservation that he continue in his purpose of giving peace to the Church. If he should depart from this purpose, they would feel obliged to recognize no other authority but that of the council.[88] Three days later, on Good Friday, the delegations from France, Germany, and England[89] met at the Franciscan monastery and drew up the four articles that became so famous. The following is the essential passage: "The Council of Constance, legitimately assembled in the Holy Ghost, forming an ecumenical council and representing the Church militant, holds its power immediately from God; and everybody, including the pope, is bound to obey it in what concerns the faith, the extinction of the schism, and the reform of the Church in its head and members."[90]

It has been maintained with much probability that the decree, taken in itself, proclaims the superiority of the council only under given circumstances, that is, in case of doubt as to the legitimacy of the popes;[91] in this sense the proposition would not be heterodox.[92] On any hypothesis, coming from an assembly that lacked the character of an ecumenical council and receiving a majority vote of men who, for the most part, had no deliberative authority, it could not have any dogmatic force.[93]

---

[87] Mansi, XXVII, p. 577; Hardouin, VIII, p. 244.

[88] Mansi, pp. 577–582; Hardouin, VIII, pp. 246–249; Hefele, X, p. 399.

[89] Mansi, pp. 582–584; Hardouin, VIII, pp. 240–251; Hefele (X, p. 401) corrects the errors as to date, by Mansi and Hardouin. Only three nations gathered. This was an additional irregularity.

[90] Mansi, pp. 584–586.

But the same could not be said of the decrees which the assembly of Constance passed against the teachings of John Hus. The Bull of Martin V against the Hussites, directing the faithful to believe what the Synod of Constance decided "in favor of the faith and for the salvation of souls" (*in favorem fidei et salutem animarum*),[94] plainly confirms those condemnations.

The doctrines of this formidable heretic, who for some years had been stirring up the masses by his impassioned preaching against the most fundamental dogmas of the Christian faith and the most essential principles of society, were a matter of grave concern to the bishops and doctors assembled at Constance from the very outset of the council. Hus had no more intense opponent than Jean Gerson.

John Hus

John Hus was born in 1369 in a village of Bohemia. Although a brilliant professor at the University of Prague, he was an orator rather than a teacher. He was a man of lofty stature and austere countenance, with a flowing eloquence, at times sharp and biting, and again vibrant and fiery. It seems that he was greatly influenced by those fanatical mystics who, under the name of *"Apostolic Brethren"* and *"Apocalyptics,"* were then spreading through Bohemia, planning a renovation of all things. The violence with which he took sides with the Czech nationality against the claims of the Saxons, Bavarians, and Poles, made Hus appear a champion of national independence. But it was especially in Wyclif's writings that he found his ideas formulated. The twenty-one propositions of that heretic which were condemned at Rome, reached Hus in 1403. The impetuous Bohemian fed upon the works of the Anglo-Saxon. He read them again and again, copied and annotated them. In the margin of some manuscripts, copied by Hus' hand and preserved at the Stockholm library, we read such expressions as this "Wyclif! Wyclif! you disturb the head of more than one!" John Hus had found his doctrine.[95]

---

[91] See Mazzella, *op. cit.*, pp. 775 sq. and Baudrillart in the *Bulletin Critique*, July 15th, 1902, p. 393.

[92] Mazzella, no. 993, pp. 775 sq.; cf. p. 747.

[93] Pastor, I, p. 198. It is true that the article in question was passed by the general assembly of the fifth session. But the voting took place amidst such disturbance, such protests and restrictions (see Hefele, X, pp. 404 sq.) that we must recognize the absence of those conditions which Gerson himself required for a decision to be taken *conciliariter* (Gerson, *Opera*, II, col. 940). Moreover, the Council of Constance should not be regarded as ecumenical except from the 42nd session to the 45th, when Pope Martin V presided over it. The approbation which Pope Martin V gave to all that the council had done "*conciliariter, et non aliter, nec alio ullo modo,*" regards principally the condemnation of Falkenberg, which was done by only two nations, Germany and France.

[94] Denzinger, no. 658 sq.

According to him, there is no intermediary between Christ and the individual man; consequently, there is no hierarchy and no Church. Along with the Church, every social institution would disappear. In his theory, no one has the right to command unless he is without sin; no one has the right to own unless he is *"faithful,"* that is, unless he is a follower of John Hus. Louis Blanc says: "Hus is the budding genius of modern revolutions." [96] By "modern revolutions" we must understand those which lead to the most radical forms of collectivism and anarchy.

"Czech radicalism," says Pastor, "constituted an international peril" as well as a religious danger. Emperor Sigismond wished to join his efforts to those of the council for the purpose of repressing it with energy. The combined action of the two powers has made it difficult at times to determine their respective responsibilities. On July 6th, 1415, Hus was condemned as a heretic, degraded, turned over to the secular arm and led to the stake. He met death courageously.[97] But the passions aroused by the heresiarch were not quieted by his death. His execution was the beginning of a prolonged civil and religious war in which the fanatical forces of the Hussites withstood the imperial armies. We shall see below how the various sects sprung from John Hus united under the name of *Moravian Brethren* and were finally absorbed in the Protestant movement. "After John Hus," says Bossuet, "a world full of bitterness gave birth to Luther."

---

[95] "Recent investigations have furnished incontestable evidence that, in the matter of doctrine, Hus owed everything to Wyclif." (Pastor, I, p. 161.)

[96] Louis Blanc, *History of the French Revolution of 1789,* I, p. 28. Krummel, a Protestant minister, says Pastor, has tried to save the honor of the Hussite movement; but Schwab has shown that this defense does not accomplish its purpose. (Pastor, I, p. 162.)

The End of the Schism

During the proceedings against John Hus, the still pending question of the abdication of the three popes began to be solved.

The undignified flight of John XXIII resulted in alienating men from him. The council's attitude towards him irritated him personally very much. On May 16th a crushing indictment against him, containing seventy-two points of accusation, was presented to the assembly.[98] Two weeks later, after a long investigation, the council, in its twelfth general session, decreed the deposition of the unworthy pope, Balthasar Cossa, and ordered that he should thereafter "be placed in a secure and suitable place under the custody of Emperor Sigismond." [99]

---

[97] The Church has been reproached for condemning Hus and handing him over to the secular arm in spite of the safe-conduct that had been granted him. It is true that a safe-conduct had been given John Hus, not by the council, but by Emperor Sigismond. But this safe-conduct simply guaranteed him against any arbitrary violence; it could not have the effect of freeing him from condemnation. On this subject see a very complete and well documented discussion in Hefele, X, pp. 521–531. The alleged decision of the council, *nullam fidem hæretico esse servandam,*" is found only in a proposal drawn up by one of the members and rejected by the assembly.

[98] Hefele, X, pp. 427 sq.

On June 3rd, the deposed Pontiff was removed to Gottlieben, to a castle of the Bishop of Constance which John Hus had just left. Louis of Bavaria, charged with the custody of the prisoner, carried out his task with the utmost rigor. John XXIII was sent into the Palatinate and lived there several years under the watchful eye of two German guards, with whom he could speak only by signs. He passed his time writing verses on the instability of human affairs. Adversity proved salutary for him. In 1418 he was restored to liberty and lived long enough to acknowledge Martin V as the true pope. He died bearing the title of Cardinal Bishop of Tusculum. His body rests in the celebrated baptistery of Florence, and on his tomb you may read this simple epitaph: "Here lies the body of Balthasar Cossa, John XXIII, who was pope."

By John's deposition the situation was restored to the point at which the Council of Pisa had found it, as inextricable now as it was then. The generosity of Gregory XII offered a solution. He announced his intention of resigning, but first sent to the members of the council a convocation in due form, which they accepted. To this true council, made legitimate by his supreme authority, Gregory XII presented his resignation. He died in 1417 with the title of Bishop of Porto and perpetual legate of Ancona. His last words were: "I have not known the world, and the world has not known me."

There remained Benedict XIII. Abandoned by all the prelates of his obedience, he withdrew into Spain, to the impregnable fortress of Pensicola, with three cardinals who had remained faithful to him. On July 22nd the council declared Piedro de Luna, so-called pope, deprived of all rights, as a notorious heretic and incorrigible schismatic. Piedro de Luna survived his deposition five years. Obstinately immovable, he was fond of saying that the whole Church was with him on the rock of Pensicola, as all humanity had been with Noë in the ark. Every morning, so they say, he hurled excommunications to the four cardinal points of the earth, which had, he said, so basely abandoned him. He died November 29th, 1422, after making his three cardinals swear to give him a successor. Thus his vain resistance continued for a few years after his death. But the newly elected antipope, an obscure Spanish canon, who called himself Clement VIII, saw his rights contested by a certain Bernard Garnier, a sacristan of Rodez, who took the name of Benedict XIV; and so the schism ended in shame and ridicule.

---

[99] Mansi, XXVII, pp. 715 sq.; Hardouin, VIII, p. 376; Hefele, X, p. 442.

With the removal of Benedict XIII, the Council of Constance remained the sole authority in the Church, in fact as well as in right. Some of the fathers thought that at last the hour had arrived to realize that important reform for which the world had so long waited. Pierre d'Ailly and Jean Gerson succeeded in having a wiser solution adopted. After passing certain disciplinary decrees, the council proceeded to the election of a new pope. On November 11th, 1417, the virtuous Cardinal Otto Colonna was chosen and assumed the name of Martin V.

This selection was welcomed with universal acclaim. In the words of a contemporary chronicle, "men could scarcely speak for joy.[100] Gregorovius, an uncompromising opponent of the papacy, acknowledges that "any temporal kingdom would have perished. But so marvelous was the constitution of this spiritual realm, and so indestructible the idea of the papacy itself, that the deepest of those schisms only shows its indivisibility." [101]

---

[100] Pastor, I, p. 208.

[101] Gregorovius, VI, p. 649.

CHAPTER VI

1417–1447

THE peace and calm which the Church enjoyed did not shield her from all dangers. After passing safely through the stormiest perils, she was now to meet the most perfidious. The commercial prosperity of the large Italian cities and the resulting habits of luxury, the coming of Greek scholars into Italy and the consequent literary and artistic movement, the consolidation of the temporal power of the Holy See and the diplomatic negotiations which that process entailed, produced an air of pagan worldliness at Rome which the papal court and even the popes themselves did not escape. In the softness of a luxurious existence, in the refined pleasures of mind or in political cares, several of them lost sight of that austerity of life exemplified by the lives of the Roman pontiffs of the Western Schism. The conscience of Christendom was finally aroused. At that time the monks and friars, the truest interpreters of public opinion, echoed its scandalized astonishment. The boldest of these popular preachers, Girolamo Savonarola, shouted his indignation in the very face of the most compromised of these pontiffs, Alexander VI. The unfortunate friar perished at the stake, but at his death the temporal prestige of the papacy had received its rudest blows. The work of reforming the Church "in head and members" became more urgently necessary than ever.

Yet the history of the Renaissance popes is not merely a chronicle of abuses. The time came when it had to be recognized that the epoch of a Christendom governed by pope and emperor had passed, that the autonomy of European States was a fact, that the Church must treat with them as one power with another. The era of concordats began. The popes of this period, who were for the most part far-sighted statesmen, understood this need and labored intelligently to provide for it. From Martin V to Leo X a positive step was taken to bring about an understanding between the Holy See and the European States. All is not dark in these last years of the fifteenth century. Though it is in vain we look for a St. Gregory VII or a St. Pius V in the Chair of Peter, we do, nevertheless, see truly great men in the interim between great saints.

Martin V

The name "Popes of the Renaissance" does not altogether fit Martin V and Eugene IV, who were rather popes of transition. Their special mission was to settle the painful problems bequeathed by the Great Schism, to rebuild the material and moral ruins left by that schism, to strengthen the unity of the Church under the supremacy of Rome, and to calm men's minds, still shaken by the impressions of the recent conflicts.

The reform of the Church in its head and members was still to be carried out. Every one was expecting a council. This word "council" exercised a sort of magical fascination over the men of that time. The conciliary theories of Gerson, d'Ailly, and Langenstein were confirmed, so it seemed, by this single fact that it was a council that had brought peace to the Church. The very event that had restored tranquillity to the Christian world would thus become a new source of discord. The history of the assemblies of Basle, Ferrara, and Florence fill the two pontificates of Martin V and Eugene IV; all other events are grouped about the history of these councils. To not a few men of this period, the council seemed a panacea for all political and social ills. It is to the councils that the Emperor of Constantinople comes to ask aid against the Turks, and it is from the councils that the union of the Latin and Greek Churches is expected. All the wars of this period are reëchoed in the councils. The fathers of Constance, when decreeing that the next conciliary assembly should take place five years later and that subsequent councils should meet periodically every seven years, encouraged similar illusions. But the events were to undeceive them. We can understand how able statesmen like Æneas Sylvius Piccolomini, profound thinkers like Nicholas of Cusa, even holy men like Cardinal Allemand, archbishop of Arles, who was beatified by Clement VII, for a long time fought in perfect good faith for the supremacy of the councils.

Martin V shared none of these vain hopes. Because of a loftier and broader view, which came perhaps from his eminent station or from that instinct of what is possible, which is communicated to a man by the responsibility of power, and doubtless also because of the graces of state which God has never refused to the head of His Church, Martin V always distrusted this system of periodical councils which was decreed at Constance. "The very mention of 'council' terrified him," says a contemporary writer.[1] To solve or forestall possible conflicts between the papacy and civil powers, he placed more trust in another procedure, which was, in fact, introduced by that same Council of Florence at its forty-third session, held under his presidency. Considering the differences of views and conflicts of interests that divided the nations, the fathers of Constance decided to regulate the relations of the Church with each nation by individual concordats. These were, so to speak, only attempts. The five concordats which Martin V concluded with France, Germany, Spain, Italy, and England seemed to be armistices rather than definitive treaties. The concordat with England was entered into *ad perpetuam rei memoriam,* whereas the others were for five years only. But therein lay the future.[2] The era of councils was followed by the era of concordats.

---

[1] *"In immensum nomen concilii abhorrebat."* Raguese, *Monumenta conciliorum,* I, p. 66; Pastor, I, p. 238; Valois, *La crise religieuse du XV^e siècle: Le pape et le concile,* p. 3.

Martin V, of Roman blood, had nothing closer at heart than to restore to the Eternal City, the center of the Christian world, that splendor which had been tarnished by recent strifes. It was an urgent undertaking after that crisis in which the unity of the Church became so seriously threatened and the authority of the Roman pontiff so hotly disputed. The disturbances still desolating the States of the Church kept the Pope two years at Florence and prevented his entry into Rome until September 20th, 1420. But he devoted himself at once to the work of restoration, on which he had determined, with a prudence and perseverance that won for him from the Romans the well-deserved title of father of the country.[3] Even the nepotism with which he is justly reproached had some excuse in the need he felt—confronted, as he was, by unanimously hostile powers—to depend upon men who would be unquestionably devoted to him.

The expiration of the time fixed by the Council of Constance for calling a new council had arrived. To oppose the movement of those who were impatiently awaiting the meeting of the conciliary assembly, was impossible. In 1423 Pope Martin in self-defense summoned the new assembly to meet at Pavia, but an outbreak of the pest necessitated its transfer to Siena. The war which at this very time was bringing France and England to blows, the terrible struggle which Spain had to sustain against the Moors, and the troubles stirred up in Germany by bands of Hussites, prevented most of the bishops from answering the summons of the Sovereign Pontiff, who promptly invoked this pretext to dissolve the council (March 7th, 1424). But the members present, even though few in number, had time to fix upon Basle as the place for the next council, which was to meet seven years later.[4]

---

[2] Cf. Baudrillart, *Quatre cents ans de concordat,* pp. 17, 44 sq. The word "concordat" is found for the first time in the Treaty of Worms, which, in 1122, put an end to the quarrel of investitures.

[3] On this subject, see L'Epinois, *op. cit.,* p. 402. We mention some of the measures undertaken by Martin V: he organized the provisioning of Rome (Theiner, *Codex diplomaticus,* f. 1861, 1862, III, 223); he took thought for the healthfulness of the city by restoring to activity the office of superintendent of streets and canals (*ibid.,* p. 231) and by appointing a protector of the course of the *Aqua Morana* (*ibid.,* p. 234); he established a commissioner for the repair of the churches and took steps to prevent their pillage (*ibid.,* p. 220); he forbade the abuses that had been introduced in the collection of tolls on the Tiber to the profit of private persons (*ibid.,* p. 229); he enforced uniformity of weights and measures (Garampi, *Saggi di osservazioni sul valore delle antiche monete pontificie,* p. 84); he prosecuted the makers of false money (*ibid.,* p. 85); he gave scrupulous attention to the selection of magistrates and syndics (Theiner, *op. cit.,* pp. 201, 218, 242, 243); for matters of greater importance or delicacy, he appointed special commissioners (Theiner, p. 239). The mere enumeration of these reforms indicates the sad state into which the temporal organization of the Papal States had fallen during the Western Schism.

Martin V is often blamed for not having labored for the reform of the Church with sufficient vigor during this interval. The fruitless crusades which he had to undertake against the Hussites and the assiduous attention required by the material restoration of the churches and monuments of Rome, were his excuse. This reform, however, did begin to take place through the pure and worthy life of this Pope, whose solid virtues were never denied by his contemporaries. In that movement which was carrying men's minds at random towards letters and art, he was able to discern and to encourage those tendencies which were Christian. We know that the meetings at Constance, where so many scholars and literary men of different nations were assembled, either as members of the council or assistants or simply out of curiosity, greatly favored the study of ancient literature. It was there that Poggio relaxed from theological discussions by rummaging the libraries and looking for precious manuscripts. It was there the Greek Chrysoloras introduced the Latins to the study of Homer and Plato. Martin V knew how to distinguish among the humanists those who kept the Christian spirit; he prudently reserved for them the dignities and responsibilities at his disposal. He bestowed the Roman purple upon the illustrious Capranica, the pious Nicholas d'Abergati of the Carthusian Order, the austere Antonio Correr, nephew of Pope Gregory XII, who distributed his great wealth in good works and died at the age of eighty after a life filled with the highest virtues, and the great Cesarini, who became papal legate at the Council of Basle and who, as Cardinal Branda said, if the Church should become corrupt, would be able to reform it single-handed.

---

[4] According to the *Instrumentum electionis civitatis basilensis,* an official document, there were present: for the Italian nation, Bishop Pietro di Castro, Doctor Dominico di San Geminiano, and Abbot Nicolas de Saint Donat representing especially the district of Siena; for the French nation, Guillaume, bishop of Cavaillon, and two abbots; for the German nation, Doctor Hartung de Kappel and the Premonstratensian Theoderich d'Andel; for the English nation, Bishop Frantz, of Aeqs in Gascony, then under the rule of England, and a canon; for the Spanish nation, Abbot Pierre de Saint Vincent, canon of Toledo. Nicolas de Saint Donat, representing Siena, and Pierre de Saint Vincent, representing Spain, declared that they had received no mandate regarding the choice of a meeting-place for the council; but the others used the full powers which they had received and the little assembly unanimously designated the city of Basle as the seat of the council. The papal legates confirmed this decision in the name of the Pope, by virtue of the powers delegated to them (Mansi, XXIX, pp. 6–10; Hefele, XI, pp. 143 sq.). Valois (*op. cit.* I, pp. 76–80) shows that the responsibility for the failure of the council assembled at Siena "falls heavily on those—princes, prelates, doctors—who, though summoned to Siena, failed to come."

Martin V also encouraged and protected the saints whom God raised up to regenerate the Church. In 1425 St. Frances of Rome, a noblewoman, wife of Lorenzo de' Ponziani, under papal auspices founded the Benedictine Oblate Congregation of Tor di Specchi at Rome. This society was made up of devout women of the world who, without any outward distinguishing mark, practiced the purest religious virtues and devoted themselves to every kind of charitable work.[5] Two years later, St. Bernardine of Siena, one of the greatest saints of this period, was falsely denounced at the judgment seat of Martin V. For almost thirty years this servant of God had been powerfully preaching renunciation and penance. Pope Martin, not only absolved him from the groundless accusations, but desired him to make Rome the particular field of his apostolate for almost three months, and even became one of his humble listeners.[6]

---

[5] Rabory, *Vie de sainte Françoise Romaine*.

But in the eyes of a prejudiced and jealous nobility these works of internal reform did not compensate for the more or less real scandals of papal nepotism. The partisans of the council bestirred themselves; they wanted to advance the date of it. Their evident intention was to use it as a weapon against the papacy. On November 8th, 1430, posters were put up in Rome during the night, threatening the Pope with a withdrawal of obedience if he delayed any longer in summoning the council. Martin V yielded to these desires. By a decree (February, 1431) he entrusted to Cardinal Cesarini the task of opening the coming council, to be held at Basle, and of presiding over it. At the same time, by another decree, he authorized his legate, in case of need, to dissolve the council or transfer it to another city. Shortly after, grief-stricken by unjust attacks against him, the Pope died, carried off by apoplexy (February 20th, 1431).[7]

The hatred that made Martin V its target was directed less against his person than against his pontifical office: this was clear from events that took place at the conclave which met to choose his successor. The Sacred College proposed for acceptance by the candidates for the tiara a "capitulation" which singularly limited the pope's powers and resources and placed him, in the government of the Church, at the mercy of the cardinals. No declaration of war, no alliance, no collection of imposts or tithes could be decided without a majority vote of the Sacred College; no appointment of cardinal, bishop, or abbot was to be made outside of consistory.[8]

---

[6] Thureau-Dangin, *Saint Bernardine of Siena.*

[7] Raynaldi, 1431, no. 5–7, and Burchard, *Diarium,* Thuasne ed., I, p. 33.

This was a new danger which, joined to the conciliary disturbances and the rivalries of princes, reappeared at every papal election throughout the whole fifteenth century. The popes indeed tried to escape from these "capitulations" by not observing them, then by recruiting the body of cardinals from among their friends and relatives. But this simply was curing one abuse by another. A college of cardinals thus made up could be nothing more than a registry office for the pope who appointed it, and often became a center of formidable opposition for his successor. No external organization could produce a true reform of the Church unless a spirit of holiness was its soul and inspiration.

Eugene IV

Gabriello Condulmaro, the newly elected Pope, took the name of Eugene IV. He had the weakness to accept the "capitulation" proposed by the Sacred College, but was not slow in freeing himself from it. Was not such a derogation of the inalienable rights of the papacy vitiated with radical nullity? The opposition, moreover, began to be discredited by its own excesses. A prejudice against the papacy, a reckless infatuation for the supremacy of councils had won many of the best men. This can be seen in the very first sessions of the Council of Basle.

The assembly was to open in March, 1431, but was able to begin its sessions only on July 23rd.[9] Fourteen bishops or abbots assembled in a hall that was almost empty, under the presidency of John of Polomar, who represented Cardinal Cesarini. The assembly proclaimed itself an ecumenical council, recalled the decree *"Frequens"* of the Council of Constance on the supremacy of councils, and drew up a programme containing three aims for its deliberations: the reform of the Church, the settlement of the Hussite question, and the reunion of the Western and Eastern Churches.

---

[8] Valois thinks (rightly, it would seem) that the capitulation, concentrating such extensive powers in the Sacred College, was directed, not only against the pope, but also against the councils, whose dominance in the affairs of the Church was much dreaded. (Valois, *op. cit.*, I, p. 100.)

[9] The documents relating to the Council of Basle are found in the *Monumenta conciliorum generalium saeculi decimi quinti*, a vast collection begun in 1857.

On September 9th, Cardinal Cesarini reached Basle to preside over the assembly as papal legate. His attitude was not free from suspicion. On the one hand, he approved all that had been done *"in statuendo et firmando concilium,"* while on the other, he seemed to be aware of the fundamental irregularity of this miniature assembly. Did these fourteen prelates have the right to declare themselves the representatives of the universal Church?[10] In great haste (September 19th) Cesarini sent a strongly worded letter to the bishops, urging them to come to the assembly at Basle; at the same time he dispatched an ambassador to the Pope to acquaint him with the situation. This ambassador, John Beaupère, a canon of Besançon,[11] presented Eugene IV with such a disheartening account of what was taking place at Basle, that the Pontiff by a Bull, *"Quoniam alto"* (December 18th, 1431),[12] by his sovereign authority decreed the dissolution of the council. Unfortunately, by the time the Bull arrived, Cesarini, who had counted on the success of his request to regularize the situation, had already (December 14th), in the cathedral of Basle, solemnly celebrated the opening of the council. The extreme exasperation of the fathers was reflected in a letter from the legate (January 13th, 1432), begging the Pope to withdraw the Bull of dissolution. It is in this letter that many historians have thought to see the prophetic announcement of the Lutheran revolt. "The axe is laid to the root of the tree," said Cesarini, "the tree inclines and is about to fall; but it still stands; and it is we who are going to hasten its fall!" [13] The council pretended to ignore the papal Bull and on January 21st, 1432, issued an encyclical letter announcing to the world its firm resolve to continue its deliberations.

---

[10] *Monumenta conciliorum,* I, p. 105.

[11] Celebrated for the part he took in the trial of Joan of Arc. See Denifle and Chatelain, *"Le procès de Jeanne d'Arc et l'Université de Paris,"* in *Mémoires de la Société de l'histoire de Paris,* p. 18.

[12] Mansi, XXIX, p. 564.

This was the beginning of the lamentable conflict that rent the Church in the most venerable organs of its hierarchy. On one side, an assembly of bishops, insignificant in number, yet backed by the great universities, which sent them enthusiastic letters, encouraged by the kings of France and Spain, the Emperor, and nearly all the rulers; on the other side, the Pope, weak, disarmed, abandoned by his own entourage, in disagreement with his legate, engaged in Rome itself with permanent uprisings that left him almost no security.

The council was emboldened and, in its second session (February 15th, 1432), renewed the famous decrees of the third, fourth, and fifth sessions of the Council of Constance and accentuated its opposition to the Sovereign Pontiff, declaring that it could not be dissolved, transferred, or postponed by any one whomsoever, not even by the Pope.[14] Under the circumstances of the case, these decrees assumed an exceptional gravity. They were not any longer, as at Constance, dealing with the problem of a dubious pope, for no one questioned the regularity of Eugene's election. Under these conditions, to declare the supremacy of the council was to alter the traditional constitution of the Church.

Yet, when the Hussite army defeated the troops of the crusade, the Pope's credit suffered a decline; an opposition party was formed against him among the cardinals, who reproached him for the hasty dissolution of the council. Cardinals Capranica, Brando, Allemand, Cervantes, and de la Rochetaille one after the other withdrew from his side and adhered to the assembly of Basle. We see Blessed Louis Allemand, archbishop of Arles, misled by an aberration that recalls the unreflecting enthusiasm of venerable fathers of the early centuries for Origenism, an aberration that makes us think of weighty personages of modern times seduced by budding Jansenism or by Liberalism in its first days. Thus did this saintly Cardinal pursue the chimera of a constitutional church concentrating its legislative, executive, and judicial jowers in the hands of a council.

---

[13] *"Jam, ut video, securis ad radicem posita est. Inclinata est arbor ut cadat, nec potest diutius persistere. Et certe, cum per se stare possit, nos ipsam ad terram praecipitamus."* Joannis de Segovia, *Historia concilii Basilensis*, in *Monumenta conciliorum generalium saeculi XV*, Palacki and Birk ed., II, p. 97.

[14] *Monumenta Conciliorum,* II, pp. 124 sq.

Allemand soon became the very soul of the Basle assembly, strongly seconded by Nicholas of Cusa, Æneas Sylvius Piccolomini, and even the legate Cesarini himself. In the council's programme, papal authority necessarily had to be lowered *pari passu* with the exaltation of the council's powers. Nicholas of Cusa, with the weighty influence that came from his eminent services, his admirable works of reform, and the austerity of his life, did not hesitate to maintain, in his treatise *De concordia catholica,* that the privilege of infallibility, having been granted by Christ to the whole Church, can belong only to an ecumenical council, representing the entire Church, and not to the pope, who is only a member.

At this painful juncture, the Pope adopted a policy from which he did not depart even to his last breath: firmly to maintain the principle of his supremacy and to yield practically all the rest. In the lengthy negotiations between Eugene IV and the fathers of Basle, too long to be detailed here, the extent of the Pope's condescension is astonishing. In vain did the council undertake to bring him to trial, summon him to appear, cite him to its judgment seat. Pope Eugene took care not to break off negotiations with the rebel assembly, even treating with it as one power with another. He was satisfied to declare, through one of his plenipotentiaries, the Archbishop of Tarentaise, the absolute primacy of his rights: "Even should the entire world turn against the pope," announced the legate, "it is the pope who must be obeyed." [15] When urged to do so by the Emperor, Eugene at length decided to withdraw his decree of dissolution and to recognize the regularity of the Council of Basle by his Bull *"Dudum sacrum"* (first form) on August 1st, 1433, then by the same Bull in its second form on December 15th, but adding in the former, "with the reservation of his own rights and those of the Apostolic See." [16] The council had reached its sixteenth session.

Meanwhile, profiting by the Pope's difficulties and by the turmoil in men's minds, Philip Maria Visconti, duke of Milan, one of those many tyrants who were desolating Italy at that time,[17] invaded the States of the Church: the Pope had no other choice but to appoint the freebooter Francesco Sforza standard-bearer of the Church and defender of its States. Thus was a new humiliation inflicted on the papal power. Nearly all the great Roman families had little by little withdrawn from Eugene, leaving him no option but flight from Rome. The unfortunate Pontiff, whose intentions were beyond blame, retired to Florence, where the renaissance was more flourishing than anywhere else and there became the enlightened protector of letters and art. After the manner of Martin V, he showed favor to Christian humanism, condemned Beccadelli, kept Valla in retirement, reserving his favors for the upright Cardinal Bessarion and the virtuous Flavio Biondo.

---

[15] *"Si totus mundus sententiaret in aliquo negotio contra papam, . . . papae sententiae standum esset."* (Mansi, XXIX, pp. 482–492.)

[16] *"Ita tamen quod . . . omnia singula contra personam, auctoritatem ac libertatem nostram et Sedis Apostolicae . . . in dicto concilio facta ac gesta . . . per dictum concilium prius omnio tollantur."* Bull of August 1st, 1435. (Mansi, XXIX, p. 574.) The Bull of December 15th did not repeat this restriction (Mansi, XXIX, pp. 78 sq.) nor did it retract it. Eugene IV takes it up again in 1446 with great force.

[17] Burckhardt, *The Civilization of the Period of the Renaissance in Italy*, I, p. 19.

The Council of Basle at its twenty-first session (June 9th, 1435) voted to abolish annates, pallium rights, taxes and imposts of every sort collected for the benefit of the Holy See. From Florence, where he was living on alms, the Pope protested by an appeal addressed to the courts of Europe. Soon Allemand, Nicholas of Cusa, and Cesarini became recklessly unrestrained. Beginning with the twenty-fifth session, scenes of tumult grew more frequent. Cardinal Allemand had the imprudence to bring into the council a certain number of ecclesiastics of the neighborhod. Thanks to their presence, the assembly came to have a clearly revolutionary majority. Cardinal Cesarini, following the Pope's wishes, had a decree passed (May 7th, 1437) that the deliberations be continued at Florence or Modena; but the opponents made such an effort to obstruct the measure that it seems the two parties came to blows in the cathedral.[18] The Archbishop of Tarentaise was obliged to take to flight.

The representatives of the Greek Church, who had been at Basle since the end of July, 1434, but had never accepted Basle as the meeting-place of the council, left the city and went to Bologna, where the Pope had been staying since April, 1436. Cesarini refused to preside over the twenty-sixth session. After patient but fruitless efforts to bring the fathers of Basle to submit, Eugene IV issued a Bull (December 30th, 1437) [19] definitively ordering the transfer of the council to Ferrara. But the prelates and various other ecclesiastics who made up the pretended majority of the council did not accept the Bull and continued to sit at Basle under the presidency of Cardinal Allemand. Thenceforth there were two assemblies. Despite the Council of Ferrara, presided over by the Pope, recognized by the Emperor, and accepted by the Greeks, the Council of Basle continued its work of violence and anarchy.

---

[18] See the dramatic account of these events in Valois, *op. cit.*, I, pp. 331–349.

[19] *Monumenta conciliorum*, II, p. 1143.

From the hour of this break, there can be no doubt as to the illegitimate character of the Council of Basle. But theologians have questioned whether the previous sessions of the council do not enjoy a doctrinal authority, at least partial. Bossuet,[20] relying on various papal Bulls and particularly on that which transferred the council from Basle to Ferrara, held the view that the council was ecumenical until January 1st, 1438, and that all its decrees had dogmatic authority. But this opinion is no longer tenable. Others have thought that the ecumenical character of the council did not carry with it the authority of its decisions relative to the power of the pope. The authority of a council, they say, is limited by the approbation which it receives from the sovereign pontiff: but Eugene IV by his first Bull *"Dudum sacrum,"* and especially by his declaration of 1446, expressly reserved all the decrees that would atack the supremacy of the Holy See.[21] Still others maintain—it seems with better reason—that, "although summoned as an ecumenical council, the Council of Basle was never so in fact; that the words of Eugene IV have not the import imputed to them; that they were written at a time when the Pope was obliged to use the utmost prudence and to avoid every expression that might arouse opposition; that the Council of Basle-Ferrara-Florence, if we may so call it, became ecumenical only from the time that it fulfilled all the conditions needed to give it an ecumenical character; that the Council of Basle, though legitimate at its beginning, according to Bellarmine's expression,[22] cannot be considered as representing the universal Church on account of the ridiculously small number of bishops taking part in it; that all its decisions were vitiated by the votes of ecclesiastics who had no right there and who made up the majority; lastly, that in the gravest circumstances, the legates did not enjoy the necessary freedom." [23]

---

[20] *Defensio declarationis cleri gallicani.*

[21] *"Absque tamen praejudicio juris, dignitatis et præeminentiae Sanctae Sedis apostolicae ac potestatis sibi et in eodem canonice sedenti in persona Beati Petri a Christo concessae."* (Raynaldi, 1446, no. 3.)

[22] Bellarmine, *De conciliorum utilitate,* bk. 2, ch. 19; *De Ecclesia militante*, bk. 3, ch. 16.

The Union of the Churches

Of the three questions which the Council of Basle set itself to solve, the most urgent was the union of the Churches. The others could wait. Several of the disciplinary reforms passed by the rebel assembly were excellent, but it seemed that the moment had not yet come to carry them out; the Hussite question received at least a provisional settlement [24] by the approbation given to the famous *Compactata* of Prague; [25] but the Greek question urgently demanded consideration. The constant advances of the Turks about Constantinople drove the Greek emperors to lean for support upon the West and to reconsider the union so happily concluded in 1274 by the second Council of Lyons and so unfortunately broken by Michael

---

[23] Baudrillart, under the word "Bâle," in the *Dictionnaire de théologie catholique* (Vacant-Mangenot). Cf. Hefele, *Histoire des conciles,* I, pp. 83–88.

[24] The Hussites, organized in military fashion, had built in the neighborhood of Prague a fortress which they called Thabor. Their demands were formulated in four articles: freedom of preaching, the use of the chalice, suppression of ecclesiastical property, and punishment of all mortal sins by the civil power. The fathers of the Council of Basle, after conferences with the moderate Hussites, called Calixtines, had it accepted by them: (1) that the use of the chalice would be granted only to those who would acknowledge the real presence under both species; (2) that mortal sins might be punished only if they were public and only by competent authority; (3) that freedom of preaching would be exercised only under the safeguard of episcopal authority; (4) that the Church could administer both movable and immovable property, as also possess the same. These were the *Compactata of Prague* (November 30th, 1433). The victory won in 1434 by the moderate Hussites over the Thaborites at Lepan, assured the success of the *Compactata.* The Calixtines returned little by little to the Roman Church; but the Thaborites retained their spirit and their doctrines in a latent condition. Later they reappeared under the name of Bohemian Brethren. (Cf. Hefele, XI, pp. 279--290.)

[25] Cf. Hefele, XI pp. 279–290.

Palaeologus. On the other hand, the prestige of their superior culture made the Greeks more than ever attractive to the literary men of Europe. In 1436, when it became known that the Emperor had invited all the Greek princes, patriarchs, and bishops living outside the Byzantine Empire, notably the princes of Russia and Wallachia, to take part in the "council of union," all Christendom rejoiced. Upon landing at Venice (February 28th, 1438), John VII Palaeologus was welcomed in the name of the Pope by Cardinal Traversari with the greatest magnificence. The scandals of the Council of Basle did not discourage the Greeks; they went to Ferrara full of confidence. The other churches of the East—Armenians, Jacobites, Copts, Chaldeans, and Maronites—followed their example. But, in the eyes of well-informed diplomats, there was one cloud that darkened the horizon. The lower the power of the Greeks had fallen, the more did their eager passion for honors seem to increase: "If the Pope is older than I," the Patriarch of Constantinople said at Venice, "I will honor him as a father; if we are of the same age, I will treat him as a brother; if he is younger, as a son." Scarcely arrived at Ferrara, he protested against the ceremony of kissing the feet. Eugene having decided to make every possible concession, dispensed all the Greeks from this ceremony. He permitted them to celebrate divine service in their own rite and granted to the Patriarch, in the cathedral where the Council was held, a seat like the Pope's, but a little lower. It took nothing less than these honors to calm the susceptibilities of the Orientals.

The Latins and the Greeks were divided on four questions: the question of the procession of the Holy Ghost (*"Filioque")*; the question of the azymes, or the kind of bread to be used in the Mass; the question of purgatory; and the question of the primacy of the pope. A commission made up of five Latin and five Greek fathers began the discussion of these questions with great candor at the third preliminary conference. But it was not long before a thousand difficulties arose. Neither the princes of the East nor those of the West, so impatiently awaited, seemed in any hurry to come to the council. The fathers of Basle, far from uniting, multiplied their curses and condemnations against the proceedings of the assembly at Ferrara. A strange demand on the part of the Emperor, namely, to enter the cathedral on horseback to take possession of his throne, came near upsetting everything. But the Pope's prudence avoided a conflict. He quieted the Emperor by showering other marks of honor on him, by granting to the Greeks the privilege of opening the first session with an inaugural address, and by yielding to them, in the discussion, the part of attack, while the Latins took that of defense. When someone offered an objection because of the absence of the prelates assembled at Basle, the Pope replied: "Where I am, with the Emperor and the Patriarch of Constantinople, there is all Christendom."

From the outset the question of the *"Filioque"* seemed to absorb all the others. The Greeks forcibly reproached the Latins with keeping the added word *"Filioque"* in their symbol despite the prohibition of the Council of Ephesus, and with teaching that the Holy Ghost proceeds from the Father *and* the Son, whereas the early fathers had taught that He proceeds "from the Father *by* the Son." Their two principal orators, of very unequal worth and ability, were the illustrious Bessarion, archbishop of Nicaea, and the astute metropolitan of Ephesus, Marcus Eugenicus, better known as Mark of Ephesus. To the first point of accusation the Latins replied that the prohibition by the Council of Ephesus against "adding a new article of faith to the symbol," had in mind only the addition of a new element, beyond the text, and not a more precise explanation of a text already contained in the symbol. They went on to say that the addition in question was such a case, for it is the constant teaching of the Greek and Latin Fathers that, to use the words of St. Basil, "everything is in common between the Father and the Son, except that the Son is not the Father." [26] To oppose any explanatory addition was to swear by the letter and to value it more than the spirit. The Archbishop of Rhodes declared: "What is the symbol of Nicaea but an explanatory amplification of the symbol of the Apostles, and the symbol of Constantinople but an explanation of that of Nicaea, and the symbol of Ephesus but an explanation of the mixed symbol formed by those of Nicaea and Constantinople? New heresies will always make new explanations necessary: to forbid them would be to doubt the word of the Master, who promised His assistance to the Church for all ages." [27]

The discussion had reached the point when the outbreak of the pestilence at Ferrara and also various administrative and financial considerations prompted the Pope to transfer the council to Florence.[28] There the dogmatic question of the procession of the Holy Ghost was taken up. John of Schwarzenberg, provincial of the Dominicans, successfully demonstrated, against Mark of Ephesus, that the Greek Fathers, in teaching that the Holy Ghost proceeds from the Father by the Son, do not set forth a doctrine different from the Latin Fathers, who teach that the Holy Ghost proceeds from the Father and from the Son; that, besides, the Latins admit only one *"principium,"* one single cause of procession, common to the Father and the Son. On Low Sunday, Bessarion delivered a magnificent discourse, declaring loyally that he was convinced by these reasons.[29] At the Emperor's invitation, the Greeks met together to deliberate as to the union. The majority declared that, as the Latin Church taught that the Holy Ghost proceeds from the Father and from the Son "as from a single principle and by a single act," there was no longer, on this score, any obstacle to the union.[30] On June 8th, 1439, the Orientals and the Westerners gave each other the kiss of peace as a sign of union.[31]

---

[26] Hefele, XI, p. 405.

[27] Mansi, XXXI, pp. 551–556.

[28] The Florentines, hoping to draw great financial profit from having the council held in their city, offered a considerable sum to the Pope. Eugene IV's finances were gravely embarrassed, he could scarcely meet the most essential expenses occasioned by the council, and, moreover, he remembered the generous hospitality he had recently received in the city of Florence; so he decided in favor of the transfer. The Greeks consented to it on condition that they be paid what was due them for the expenses of their stay and that they be granted new financial advantages. (Hefele, XI, p. 414.)

The points that remained for discussion had but a secondary importance. In the matter of the Eucharist, it was defined that transubstantiation takes place as well with leavened as with unleavened bread.[32] As for Pugatory, while they did not pretend to come to any special conclusion as to its nature or location, they declared that it is a place where souls are purified which have not completely "satisfied for their sins by sufficient fruits of penance." They added "that the souls of persons dying in the state of actual or original sin descend into hell, there to undergo diverse pains." [33] In the matter of the primacy of the pope, it was declared by the Council of Florence with a clearness and precision never before attained in an official document of the Church. Greeks and Latins proclaimed and defined that "the Holy See and the Roman pontiff is the successor of blessed Peter, prince of the Apostles, true Vicar of Christ, Father and Doctor of all Christians." [34] Yet, after thus putting themselves solemnly on record, the Greeks withdrew and, under the influence of political rivalries and racial antipathies, again separated from the Roman Church. But they had signed the condemnation of their own schism.[35]

---

[29] Mansi, XXXI, p. 878.

[30] Denzinger, no. 691.

[31] Mansi, XXXI, p. 894.

[32] Denzinger, no. 692.

[33] *"Illorum autem animas, qui in actuali peccato vel solo originali decedunt, mox in infernum descendere, poenis tamen disparibus puniendas."* (Denzinger, no. 693.) By the word "hell," the council evidently, according to the language of the time, meant simply exclusion from Heaven.

[34] *"Item definimus, sanctam Apostolicam Sedem, et Romanum Pontificem, in universum orbem tenere primatum, et ipsum Pontificem romanum successorem esse Beati Petri principis apostolorum et verum Christi vicarium, totiusque Ecclesiae caput et omnium christianorum patrem et doctorem existere; et ipsi in beato Petro pascendi, regendi ac gubernandi universalem Ecclesiam a Domino nostro Jesu Christo plenam potestatem traditam esse."* (Denzinger, no. 594; *Monumenta conciliorum*, III, p. 336.)

The act of union was promulgated July 6th, 1439. "Rejoice, ye heavens," said the fathers, "let the earth leap for joy! Fallen is the wall that separated the Eastern and Western Churches!"

Nevertheless Mark of Ephesus could not tolerate the humiliation of what he called his defeat, but what he should have called the victory of truth and peace. The cunning Patriarch, who had found a pretext for not assisting at the final deliberations, refused to sign the act of union. Presently he began seizing every occasion to stir up trouble and to incite clergy and monks against the council. Cleverly exploiting prejudice, passion, and national animosity, he soon acquired an almost universal popularity. Thenceforth Mark of Ephesus was the hero of the Greeks; Oriental prelates were called the slaves of the Latins, apostates, traitors. A few bishops were won over to the movement. The Emperor took alarm and supported the cause of the council only half-heartedly. Once again the Greek Church returned to open schism.[36]

The council continued its sessions for three years, publishing in succession decrees of union with the Armenians, Jacobites, Ethiopians, Syrians, and Chaldeans. In the act of union with the Armenians is to be found the celebrated *Decretum ad Armenos,* containing a remarkably complete statement of the doctrine of the Sacraments.[37]

Not all the Greeks joined the defection. The most illustrious of them, the great Bessarion, who had been the most active and sincere of the peace negotiators, remained faithful to the Roman Church, as did also several of the most renowned of his compatriots. He was made a cardinal (December 8th, 1439) and labored all the rest of his life to reëstablish the union so unhappily broken. His name and labors are still an inspiration to those who in our day are devoting themselves to the work of the union of the two Churches.

---

[35] The next day Joseph, patriarch of Constantinople, died, leaving a profession of faith susceptible of a Catholic interpretation. (See Hefele, XI, pp. 444–449.)

[36] Mark of Ephesus died impenitent at Constantinople, June 23rd, 1449, after a very painful illness. Cf. Pétridès, *"La mort de Marc d'Ephèse,"* in the *Echos d'Orient,* January, 1910, VI, p. 19.

[37] Denzinger, nos. 695–702.

At the Council of Basle there was a party that resolutely entered upon the path of schism. Although abandoned by Cesarini, Nicholas of Cusa, and several of the most notable fathers, even after the decree of dissolution, 25 bishops and 17 abbots continued to legislate against the Pope. They declared Eugene IV deposed (January 24th, 1438); about nine months later they elected an antipope, the ambitious Duke Amadeus of Savoy, who took the name of Felix V. But, when abandoned by Aragon and Scotland and no longer supported by Germany and France, the schismatical assembly received its fatal blow. The celebrated Æneas Sylvius Piccolomini, who became Pius II, was, like Cesarini and Nicholas of Cusa, disillusioned; he used his astute talents to destroy the authority of the pseudo-council.

The Pragmatic Sanction of Bourges

Unfortunately France and Germany did not at once grasp that the solution of the crisis was to be found in concluding concordats with the Holy See, now restored to all its rights. At the Council of Basle no "nation" showed itself more determined than the "French nation" to force reform decrees on the Pope; no one more violently attacked the Roman court than the head of the French embassy, Amédée de Talaru, archbishop of Lyons.[38] The cause of this opposition was not so much a schismatical spirit on the part of King Charles VII, as it was a grievance about questions of imposts and benefices. The French found fault with the Pope for disposing of French benefices to the profit of foreigners;[39] they complained of financial measures which for a century had been drawing into Italy French gold, "that true, pure blood of the realm," as one Gallican called it.

---

[38] Valois, *Histoire de la Pragmatique Sanction de Bourges,* pp. lxxvi sq.

When the Council of Basle promulgated its reform decrees, Charles VII found himself much embarrassed. What should he do about it? Should he accept the decrees of the council *in toto?* That would be schism, with its dread consequences. Should he reject them *in toto?* But the King of France feared lest this would be granting too much to the Pope, would be to make his own policy self-contradictory. The conciliary decrees of July 13th, 1433, and March 22nd, 1436, required that the right of canonical electors be not suspended except "for grave, evident, and reasonable cause"; the decrees of March 22nd, 1436, abolished all reservations, save those admitted in the *Corpus juris;* that of January 24th, 1438, suppressed the right of appeal to the Roman Court except in the weighty cases enumerated in the canon law: these were too conformable to the wishes of the French chancery for the King not to try to keep them. "In such junctures it was the practice of the French kings to shield themselves, at least formally, with a decision of the clergy of the realm."[40] Charles VII summoned a meeting of the clergy at Bourges on May 1st, 1438, at which papal nuncios and envoys of the Council of Basle were also present. After several days of debate, during which the claims of the pope and the council were set forth and discussed at length, the assembly decided that each decree of Basle should be submitted separately, so that it might be freely accepted, altered, or rejected. In fact, a great number of decrees, whose only fault was that they had been enacted by an illegitimate assembly, were accepted: such were those concerning the recitation of the canonical hours and the proper care of churches,[41] the abuse of the interdict,[42] trivial appeals.[43] The tone of some decisions was softened.[44] But the decree that renewed the doctrine of Constance on the supremacy of councils was entirely adopted, and the assembly of Bourges did not hesitate to suppress the measures that referred to papal intervention in the conferring of benefices. Of its own accord, the assembly decreed severe penalties against those who should accept or obtain "expectatives." [45]

---

[39] *Ibid.,* pp. lvi sqq.

[40] *Ibid.,* p. lxxviii.

The Pragmatic Sanction of Bourges, promulgated July 7th, 1438, was prefaced by a violent preamble, in which there was mention of "unbridled cupidity," "benefices given to foreigners," "gold transported outside the kingdom." The next day Charles VII informed the Council of Basle that he accepted its reforms in principle.

This act, of course, violated the neutrality which the assembly of Bourges pretended to maintain between the pope and the council. Two years later, after the scandalous election of the antipope Felix V, a new assembly at Bourges clearly divorced the cause of the French clergy from that of the schismatical assembly and declared its intention to continue in obedience to Eugene IV. But the Sovereign Pontiff never accepted Charles VII's Pragmatic Sanction. The conflict was ended only by the concordat of 1516, between Leo X and Francis I.

Thanks to the active steps taken by Æneas Sylvius Piccolomini, Germany was earlier in reaching the normal solution of a concordat. A diet at Mayence (1439) had declared for the principles of the pseudo-council of Basle almost in the sense of the Pragmatic Sanction of Bourges; but the clever Æneas Sylvius prevented the declaration of Mayence from having the force of law, by winning Emperor Frederick III to the Pope's cause. The "Princes' Concordat" (February, 1447) was a forerunner of the "Concordat of Vienna" (February 17th, 1448), which, a year after Eugene's death, in its chief provisions renewed the concordat signed at Constance under Martin V.

---

[41] Sess. XXI, c. 3-11.

[42] Sess. XX, c. 1-3.

[43] Sess. XX, c. 4.

[44] For example, those excluding the Pope's nephews from the Sacred College and suppressing the annates.

[45] Valois, pp. lxxxiv-xc.

Felix V, abandoned by nearly every one, abdicated the next year. He was the last of the antipopes.

Joan of Arc

The disastrous setback which the Christian armies suffered in the battle with the Turks at Varna, in 1444, darkened Eugene IV's last years. The preaching of the crusade had, as usual, aroused popular enthusiasm; but the greater number of European rulers showed themselves cold towards the undertaking. Three heroes, Scanderbeg, Janos Hunyady, and King Ladislas of Hungary, led to the combat the masses of the common people who had flocked to join the Hungarian, Polish, and Albanian troops. But they had to yield in the presence of superior forces.

Some years before, the Pope might have wondered whether the "Eldest Daughter of the Church" was not about to disappear as an independent nation. Since the battle of Agincourt (1415), which subjected France to English supremacy, France had continued to decline. A celebrated writer of the time represented her as a noble but sad queen, whose crown was almost falling off, while her three children—the clergy, the nobility, and the third estate—were unable to come to her assistance.[46] In the spring of 1429, under the inspiration

[46] Chartier, *Le quadrilogue invectif.*

of God, there arose a humble maiden, who embodied the patriotism of the conquered people. After a glorious campaign on the banks of the Loire, Joan of Arc succeeded in having Charles VII crowned at Rheims. But, with the connivance of the Burgundians and the complicity of Jean le Maistre, vice-inquisitor of France, the English wrought the maid's condemnation by an irregular court [47] and burned her at the stake in the public square of Rouen (1431). Joan's execution was the turning point for the French arms. Six years later, in accord with the maid's prediction, the white fleur-de-lis banner floated over Paris. After seven years more, the English were, to use the words of the Maid of Orleans, "kicked out of France." The War of the Roses was England's expiation for the crime of Rouen.[48]

The liberation of France was not the only result of Joan's mission. At a time when the modern idea of nationality was arising in opposition to the medieval concept of Christendom, Joan, in the simplicity of her patriotism and faith, "incarnated both the young idea of national integrity and the old idea of Christian unity by correcting and completing them, the one by the other." [49] It was chiefly because she regarded France as the champion of Christendom that she wished France to be victorious. "Those who make war on the said holy realm," she wrote to the duke of Burgundy, "are making war on King Jesus." [50]

---

[47] The irregularities in Joan of Arc's trial were numerous. The most serious was the substitution, in the documents, of a form of abjuration different from that which the accused had read near the Church of Saint Ouen. Pierre Cauchon, "an old hand, long practiced in the trickeries of chicanery, knew how to conduct the discussions so as to give the illusion that he respected the rules of law. In reality, he sought only to stifle the truth. . . . The judges suspected of sympathy for the Pucelle were excluded or intimidated. . . . The preliminary inquiries made at Domrémy, being favorable to Joan of Arc, were passed over in silence and omitted in the report. . . . Cauchon offered a counsellor to the accused only at the close of the trial. More than that, he charged Loyseleur, a canon of Rouen, to give her, under the seal of confession, advice that was calculated to destroy her." (Petit-Dutaillis in Lavisse, *Histoire de France,* IV, part 2, p. 64. See *"Le procès de Jeanne d'Arc"* in Leclercq, *Les martyrs,* VI, pp. 9, 295.)

[48] On Joan of Arc, see Wallon, *Jeanne d'Arc;* Petit de Julleville, *Joan of Arc;* Dunand, *Histoire complète de Jeanne d'Arc;* Ayroles, *La vraie Jeanne d'Arc;* Quicherat, *Procès de condamnation et de réhabilitation de Jeanne d'Arc;* Chevalier, *L'abjuration de Jeanne d'Arc au cimetière de Rouen;* Dunand, *Études critiques sur l'histoire de Jeanne d'Arc.* Anatole France published a *Life of Joan of Arc,* which is reviewed by Andrew Lang in his *M. Anatole France on Jeanne d'Arc.* Cf. *Revue des Deux Mondes,* April 15th, 1909, pp. 910–983. See also d'Argentré, *Collectio judiciorum.*

After the expulsion of the English she contemplated another campaign, in which she would advance side by side with the English under the standard of Charles VII to fight for the general interests of Christendom. To lead the pacified Christian world to a new crusade was her supreme aim.[51] Amidst an age of corruption and scandal this daughter of the people cast on the world such a glow of valor and purity, of delicate piety and sturdy common sense, that the earth was, so to speak, rejuvenated. "To destroy English dominance," wrote Christina of Pisa, "is the least of the deeds reserved for her. She has a higher exploit to perform: it is to keep the faith from perishing." [52] The people's instinct perceived the breadth of that mission, for in one of the prayers which they recited at mass for the captive Joan, they said to God: "Grant us to see her, unharmed and freed from the power of the English, accomplish to the letter all that Thou hast ordered her to do by one and the same mission." [53]

Eugene IV died February 23rd, 1447. His physical and moral qualities gave no premonition of the almost continual humiliations of his pontificate. He was of noble birth, of tall stature, with a face so imposing that it is said persons admitted to his presence dared not raise their eyes to him. He was good and generous and always led the life of a holy priest. No one presumed to suspect him of distributing favors to his relatives and friends. He was one of those men who have to bear the weight of misfortunes accumulated by the fatality of events and the wickedness of men, and who receive the reward of their earthly trials only in the next life.

---

[49] Goyau, *Vielle France, Jeune Allemagne*, p. 20.

[50] Ayroles, *op. cit.*, VI, p. 58.

[51] On this project of Joan of Arc, see Goyau, ch. 2: (*"Jeanne d'Arc, nationalité et Chrétienté"*).

[52] Cited by Ayroles, III, p. 265.

[53] *Ibid.*, I, pp. 78–80, 687.

CHAPTER VII

1447–1492

THE last excesses of the assembly at Basle, even more than the condemnations by Eugene IV, destroyed esteem for that famous "conciliary theory" which had momentarily dazzled the world. About 1450, when the scholarly Spanish theologian Juan de Torquemada, published his celebrated *Summa against the Enemies of the Church and of the Primacy of the Pope,* men's minds were prepared to grasp it. The sovereign pontiffs from Nicholas V to Leo X encountered no opposition like that which had embarrassed the action of their immediate predecessors. But the danger which Martin V and Eugene IV foresaw in humanism continued to grow. Whoever fails to penetrate beneath the surface of the external events filling the reigns of Nicholas V, Callistus III, Pius II, Paul II, Sixtus V, Innocent VIII, Alexander VI, Julius II, and Leo X, will find this whole period a complicated tangle of negotiations and intrigues, learned theological disputes and bloody wars, noble works of holiness and abominable crimes, unsurpassed masterpieces of the purest art, and the most deplorable scandals. Whoever looks for the inspiring idea of this epoch, will find one fact dominating all. The rising flood of a paganism devoid of morality, finding expression in Machiavelli's *Principe* and Poggio's *Facetiae,* reached the nobility and the world of literary men under Nicholas V and Callistus III; under Pius II it entered the papal court; through the weakness of Sixtus IV it was introduced into the college of cardinals, and finally ascended the papal throne with Innocent VIII and Alexander VI. The lofty qualities of Julius II and Leo X were powerless to restore to the Holy See the glorious luster of past times.

By good fortune, the faith was still very much alive in the common people, the bourgeoisie, and a small section of the political or intellectual aristocracy. Undeniable evidence of it can be found in the admirable records of the period,[1] in the popularity enjoyed by such writings as the *Regola del governo di cura familiare* by Giovanni Dominici,[2] and the *Regola di vita cristiana* attributed to St. Antoninus,[3] in the numerous works of charity, societies, confraternities, pious associations, and third orders, which spread over Rome and all Italy,[4] in the incomparable artistic masterpieces in which the most worldly painters, sometimes also the most immoral, expressed the purest and sincerest religious spirit. So true is it that a work of art depends more upon the period in which it is conceived than upon the artist who executes it. The general tendency of the age, the appreciation of the public before whose eyes he exhibits his work, the models that he has before him, the whole atmosphere so impossible to define, make an impression on the artist even without his realizing it. But the atmosphere of the fifteenth century was still very religious. It was that religious atmosphere which made possible the vigorous protests of so many preaching monks and friars who, from St. Bernardine of Siena to Savonarola, ceased not to rise up against the scandals of this world and prepared the way for the reforms of the Council of Trent.

Nicholas V

In the conclave held after the death of Eugene IV, the two parties of Orsini and Colonna, which we have seen in conflict over the government of Rome ever since Boniface VIII, strove against each other for a while, then came to an agreement to elect a man known for his aloofness from all parties, Tommaso Parentucelli, who took the name of Nicholas V. He was the son of an humble physician in the village of Sarzano in Liguria. After filling the post of tutor in several noble families of Florence, he entered the service of the devout and scholarly Nicolo Albergati. This brought him into relation with a number of learned and literary men and developed his keen love of arts and letters without harming the exemplary regularity of his life or the purity of his morals. He was short and thin, with a weak constitution, but his black, piercing eyes revealed the intellectual inquisitiveness of his soul and also, as it seemed, his lively and impetuous character.[5]

---

[1] Pastor, V., pp. 11 sqq.

[2] *Ibid.*, p. 25.

[3] *Ibid.*, p. 28.

[4] *Ibid.*, pp. 35–66.

Posterity called him the father of humanism. But Nicholas V has other claims on the gratitude of the Church. Being an accomplished statesman, he was able, at the outset of his pontificate, to make peace with King Alfonso of Naples, whose hostility might have been very injurious to the interests of the Holy See. In the early days of his pontificate, he agreed to observe the terms of the conventions entered into between Eugene IV and Frederick III, which served as a prelude to the important concordat of Vienna, decreed in principle on February 17th, 1448, and solemnly confirmed a month later. By this act, which was soon accepted by all the States of the Empire, the King of the Romans recognized the Pope's right to the annates and reservations established by canon law; the appointment of bishops was regulated: this was to be done by free choice and was to be considered final only with the pope's confirmation, who for grave and evident reasons had the right, after consulting the cardinals, to set aside the designated candidate and appoint in his stead another more worthy and competent.[6] "This concordat," says Pastor, "practically put an end to the Council of Basle," which, however, still dragged on a painful existence until 1449. To cover its retreat, it hastened to elect with due solemnity as pope "Tommaso Sarzano," that is, Nicholas V, and after this childish measure, which fooled nobody, voted its own dissolution (April 25th, 1449).[7]

---

[5] See the documents cited by Pastor, II, pp. 19 sqq. and Valois, *Le pape et le concile,* II, p. 324.

[6] In Hefele (XI, pp. 565–573) there is a detailed analysis of this concordat.

The administrative talent and apostolic zeal of Nicholas V were shown in the important missions entrusted in 1450 and 1451 to Cardinal d'Estouteville in France and Cardinal Nicholas of Cusa in Germany. The special object of the former's mission was the reform of the collegiate churches, schools, and universities.[8] Bessarion, as legate to Bologna, later on restored its ancient university and reëstablished its prosperity, so that the inhabitants, according to an inscription on their walls, proclaimed him the benefactor of the city. Nicholas of Cusa undertook a vaster work. This great man had chosen for his motto: "To purify without destroying, to restore without crushing." By wise regulations, by the mild persuasion of his gentle words, and still more by his example, he reformed abuses that had entered the lives of the clergy, brought the monasteries back to a strict observance of their rules, fought against superstitions, and removed the last traces of the schism.

Meanwhile St. John Capistran, a worthy son of St. Francis of Assisi, was visiting all parts of Germany, Italy, and Poland. He preached on improvised platforms in the public squares so effectively that his hearers were often moved to tears of repentance and cast at his feet such objects of luxury as playing cards and indecent pictures. The saint would then make a bonfire of them. Nicholas V, to aid the saintly missioner's apostolate, gave him most extensive powers and granted indulgences to those who would hear his sermons.

---

[7] Raynaldi, 1449, no. 6.

[8] Cardinal d'Estouteville also honored himself by introducing the process of Joan of Arc's rehabilitation.

The jubilee of 1450, with its throngs of pilgrims of all nations coming to Rome and its splendid festivities, helped not a little to reanimate the piety of the faithful and to renew their veneration for the center of Catholic unity. The crowning of Emperor Frederick III, which took place at Rome two years after, was not without influence on the moral authority of the papacy. It was the last imperial coronation in the Eternal City.

The protection which Nicholas V gave to humanism is his great glory in the eyes of profane history. But this trait of his pontificate the Christian historian cannot admire without qualification. By entrusting important offices at the pontifical court to learned and literary men, Nicholas' only aim was to encourage the progress of letters and science. But it came to pass, as Platina says, that "these papal secretaries labored much more for the library than for the Church." [9] And even worse happened. Poggio's *Facetiae* presently revealed the depth of the evil.

The renaissance of ancient arts and letters, if its only effect had been to clothe religious thought with a more perfect form, would have deserved the encouragement of the Roman pontiffs. But this cult of pagan art and literature, entering Italy at the very time when incredible material prosperity was hardening men's hearts,[10] when the collapse of medieval institutions had delivered the peninsula to the mercies of numerous petty tyrants and pitiless freebooters, when the pride of literary and scientific discoveries intoxicated men's minds, became a worship of physical beauty and brutal force and often resulted in the spread of pagan thought, the nourishing of selfish individualism, and the strengthening of a passion for human glory, which insensibly took the place of all other sentiments of heart and mind. The humanists, by their praise of Brutus and Cassius, everywhere produced to some extent incarnations of their heroes.[11]

---

[9] Platina, *De vitis pontificum,* Nicholas V.

[10] "The fertile soil of Italy," says Guicciardini, "was overflowing with men, merchandise, and riches of all sorts." (*Storia d'Italia,* I, p. 1. Cf. Pastor, V, p. 104.)

Stefano Porcaro, whom contemporaries compared to Catiline, was one of these incarnations. He came of a noble Tuscan family and in his youth was called to fill the honorable functions of captain of the people at Florence. His mind he fed with memories of the Roman Republic. Soon he had only one desire, namely, to restore his country to its ancient liberty. Seditious speeches, delivered openly in Rome, and a popular uprising provoked by him, prompted the Pope to remove him to Bologna under the watchful eye of Bessarion. But one day, after eluding the Cardinal's vigilance, he returned to Rome, gathered his conspirators together, collected a supply of arms, and enlisted a certain number of *bravi* ready for any undertaking. He said to them: "I have decided to rescue you from servitude and bestow wealth upon you." Their plan was to set fire to the Vatican during some great papal ceremony; in the ensuing confusion and disorder they would seize the Pope and, if need be, massacre him.

But the plot leaked out. The conspirators, surrounded in the house where they were gathered, defended themselves desperately; Porcaro was seized in a hiding-place where he had taken refuge. While he was being led in chains to the Vatican, he cried out: "People, will you let your liberator die?" But no one made a move to rescue him. On January 9th he met the death which he so well deserved: he was hanged on the platform of the Castel Sant' Angelo. His last words were: "O my people, this day your liberator dies!"

This event made a deep impression on Nicholas V. Henceforth he never found any quiet of mind. He was like one obsessed with the thought of the ancient republic threatening his life, Rome, and all Christendom. Porcaro's conspiracy took place at the begining of 1453; on July 8th, Rome received word of the capture of Constantinople by the Turks. This was the catastrophe most dreaded. It meant that Europe was open to the inroads of the infidels. Those Christian peoples who had been given peace with so great difficulty, those monasteries recently reformed, those universities just rising from their ruins, Rome itself again enjoying the splendor of the great Christian feasts, arts and letters flourishing everywhere, that Vatican Library now enriched with so many precious manuscripts—all was perhaps about to perish under the blows of the inexorable enemy of the Christian name.

---

[11] Pastor, V, p. 134.

The emotion of such thoughts crushed the remaining strength of the unfortunate Pontiff. He began to drag himself wearily to the grave. At the hour of his death, during the night of March 24th, 1455, he recovered a surprising dignity and calm. He adjured those about him to labor for the good of the Church; "then Nicholas raised his hands to heaven and said: 'Almighty God, give thy Holy Church a pastor who will uphold her and make her to increase' . . . Then with dignity he raised his right hand and said in a clear, distinct voice, '*Benedicat vos omnipotens Deus, Pater et Filius et Spiritus Sanctus*' . . . 'It was long,' says Vespasiano da Bisticci, since any pope had passed in such manner into eternity.' "[12]

Callistus III

The struggle against the threatening power of Islam was the chief objective of the policy of the Holy See during the pontificates of Callistus III, Pius II, Paul II, and Sixtus IV. Upon Mahomet II, the conqueror of Constantinople, depended freedom of navigation on the Mediterranean, the prosperity of commerce with the Levant, the safety of Greece and Hungary, and thereby of all Europe. While secular princes, absorbed in their individual quarrels and immediate interests, remained indifferent, the papacy had the honor of taking in hand the general interests of Europe as well as those of the Church. When assuming the tiara (April 8th, 1455), Callistus III, successor of Nicholas V, took a solemn oath "in the presence of the Holy Trinity, Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, and in the presence of the ever Virgin Mother of God, and of the holy Apostles Peter and Paul," to do his utmost, even should it require the shedding of his blood, to recover Constantinople from the power of Islam.[13]

---

[12] *Ibid.*, II, p. 312.

The feeble old man who made that promise—he was seventy-seven years old—belonged to the time-honored Spanish family of the Borja or, as the Italians spell it, Borgia. Keen intellect, strong will, and physical beauty characterized the men of that race, who, in holiness as in vice, exhibited the extremes of their qualities and gave the world a St. Francis Borgia after an Alexander VI. Callistus III kept his oath to the very day of his death. In the first year of his pontificate he issued a Bull summoning all rulers to the defense of Europe, then menaced by the Turks. But he did more. We see him undertaking at Rome itself the construction and arming of a fleet, turning the banks of the Tiber into shipbuilding yards, and, in spite of ridicule from those who treated his project as chimerical, succeeding in launching (April, 1456) twenty-five vessels carrying a thousand sailors, five hundred soldiers, and three hundred cannon.[14]

---

[13] D'Achery, *Spicilegium,* III, p. 797.

[14] It has been repeatedly alleged that, in 1456, Callistus III instituted the prayer called the *Angelus* on the occasion of the appearance of the comet whose periodicity has been shown by Halley. "They considered it a certain sign of divine wrath," says Flammarion; "the Mahomedans saw in it a cross, the Christians a yataghan. In so great a danger Pope Callistus III ordered that the bells in all the churches should be rung every day at noon, and he invited the faithful to say a prayer in order to exorcise the comet and the Turks. This custom is still kept up among all Catholic nations. From that time dates the *Angelus.*" (*Popular Astronomy,* p. 479.) The same explanation is given by Guillemin (*The World of Comets,* p. 26) and Arago (*Popular Astronomy,* I, p. 655). In matter of fact, Pope Callistus' action in regard to the comet of 1456 was of an entirely different sort and the

But Germany, more divided than ever, as also France and England, ever on the watch against each other, made no haste to answer the Pope's appeal; three Spanish captains, under orders to engage the Turks in the Aegean Sea, stopped on their way to ravage the Genoese coast;[15] the powerful Duke of Burgundy was satisfied with making fair promises; King Christian of Norway and Denmark and King Alfonso of Portugal looted the funds destined for the crusade; the wealthy republic of Venice, thinking only of its commercial interests, entered into friendly relations with the Sultan and obstructed the Pope's action. Hungary alone, which was hard pressed by the Turks, made a heroic effort. The great Janos Hunyady, ably seconded by the papal legate, Juan Carvajal, and the ardent Friar Minor, St. John Capistran, won some brilliant victories under the walls of Belgrade in 1456. On receipt of this news, several bands of crusaders from Germany, France, England, and other countries set out for the Orient. "The German crusaders were joined," the chronicle of Spires informs us, "by

practice of the *Angelus* had an altogether different origin. Platina (*Lives of the Popes,* p. 385) relates that "there appeared a comet for some days hairy and red; of which when the astrologers said that it portended a great plague, dearth, or some mighty slaughter, Callistus appointed a fast for several days to pray to God that if any judgment hung over them, He would be pleased to avert it and turn it upon the Turks, the enemies of Christianity. He likwise gave orders that God should be supplicated every day, and that a bell should be rung about noon to give people notice when they should join in prayer for the Christians against the Turks." This document is the only source of the legend. There is question neither of a Bull nor of an exorcism of the comet, but simply of dangers that were announced by learned men. We know that scholars of our own day have supposed that the atmosphere of comets contains gases that would be dangerous in the by no means chimerical case that the orbit of the comet's nucleus should meet the earth's orbit. The practice of the *Angelus* was a gradual development in the Church. The ringing of a bell in the evening seems to go back to the thirteenth century and is connected with the custom of curfew. The morning bell is first mentioned in the fifteenth century. The bell at noon was rung, before the time of Callistus III, on Fridays in memory of our Savior's passion. Callistus introduced the practice of ringing it every day. (See Vacant's *Dict. de théologie,* art. "*Angelus*" by Dom Berlière, and *Revue Pratique d'Apologétique,* December 1st, 1909, art. "*Une comète excommuniée,*" by Lesêtre.

[15] Pastor, II, p. 365.

crusaders from England, France, and other countries, among whom were 'priests and monks, and they were mostly poor working people.' "[16] In August, 1457, Callistus' courage was revived by a victory of the papal fleet, which captured no less than twenty-five ships at Mitylene.

The heroic Scanderbeg, duke of Albania, continued the exploits of Janos Hunyady, who died August 11th, 1456, in a terrible epidemic and was shortly followed to the tomb by St. John Capistran. Soon after, Scanderbeg was betrayed by his own nephew, Hamsa, who had been seduced by Mahomet and turned against the Christians. In Hungary the discord which broke out between the nobles and the court paralyzed the forces of the country. When Callistus III, after a long illness, which was powerless to abate his courage or diminish his activity, drew his last breath (August 6th, 1458), Islam was victorious.

History owes a tribute of admiration to this Pope for his vigorous activity against the Mussulmans. France is indebted to him for Joan of Arc's rehabilitation, which was solemnly promulgated July 7th, 1456. But his memory cannot be freed from the well-grounded accusation of nepotism. Gregorovius compares the Borgias to the Claudii of ancient Rome. Those sturdy, passionate, pompous, insolent men, with a bull depicted on their coat-of-arms, filled the chanceries. Callistus introduced them into the Sacred College. Cardinal Hergenröther, referring to Callistus' raising two of his nephews to the cardinalate, says: "The new cardinals had not as yet done anything to merit the dignity conferred on them; they were both very young—Rodrigo only five and twenty—their elevation was in itself an unjustifiable action, and the evil was aggravated by the fact that Rodrigo was an immoral and vicious man."[17] This Rodrigo Borgia, who was reproached by Pope Pius II four years later for his scandalous immorality,[18] became Alexander VI.

---

[16] Quoted by Pastor, II, p. 412.

[17] Quoted by Pastor, II, p. 451.

Pius II

Æneas Sylvius Piccolomini, whom the Sacred College raised to the sovereign pontificate August 19th, 1458, took the name of Pius II. He did not come, like Callistus III, of fighting stock. He was a humanist and a diplomat, and under both aspects renowned throughout Europe. No one was unaware, and he himself honestly acknowledged, that he had need of forgiveness for part of his life, passed in libertinism and schism.[19] He was born in the neighborhood of Siena in 1405 of an impoverished noble family and from childhood was intensely devoted to classical studies.

The young Piccolomini, arriving at Basle as a cardinal's secretary at the age of twenty-six, at once fell under the pernicious influence of pagan humanism and the schismatic spirit. He suffered himself to be drawn into the movement with all the impetuosity of his temperament and all the keenness of his flexible and acute mind. The experience did, in the end, improve his sincere and upright nature. In 1442 he withdrew from his allegiance to the antipope, Felix V, and accepted an appointment in the imperial chancery. His moral conversion followed his political two years later. On March 8th, 1446, he wrote in the following terms to a friend: "He must be a miserable and graceless man who does not at last return to his better self, enter into his own heart, and amend his life: who does not consider what will come in the other world after this. Ah! John, I have done enough and too much evil! I have come to myself; oh, may it not be too late!" [20] It was at this time he was ordained to the priesthood at Vienna. We know the valuable services he then rendered to the cause of the unity of the Church. When, twelve years later, the choice of the conclave fell upon him, he was overwhelmed. His biographer tells us that the prospect of coming perils weighed heavily on his mind and he took full account of the loftiness of his office.[21] No one knew better than he the evils from which the Church was suffering: in his career as a diplomat and a humanist, he had seen them all too closely.

---

[18] See the letter of Pius II in Pastor, II, p. 452.

[19] Æneas Sylvius, before he became a priest, had two natural children. Pastor, I, p. 342. His *Tractatus de duobus amantibus* is an erotic work.

[20] Pastor, I, p. 344.

In the East, the old Greek Empire, whose decrepitude had been a guarantee of security for Europe, gave way to a young, conquering power, animated by a spirit of savage energy.[22] In Italy, the rivalry between the houses of Anjou and Aragon for the kingdom of Naples assumed the proportions of a European conflict because of the family connections of the competitors. At Rome, the freebooter Piccinino with more than twenty bandits like himself was ready to repeat Porcaro's criminal attempt. In France the quasi-schism of the Pragmatic Sanction of Bourges increased the difficulties in the way of the exercise of papal sovereignty. Bohemia was still being stirred up by the Hussites. Wherever literary culture penetrated, it assumed more and more the character of pagan sensuality and sometimes of open impiety.

Pius II was far from exemplifying the ideal of a saint, in the sense of heroic perfection which we attach to the word. Too much complacency in his own worth appears in his writings, too many genuine weaknesses appeared in his administration, which was often notably influenced by nepotism. But he understood well enough that a pope's programme of reform ought to be founded on a reform of his own life. It is impossible to doubt the sincerity of his faith, his tender devotion to the Blessed Virgin, the penitential spirit in which he endured his many infirmities to the end of his life. When only fifty-three years old, he had the face of a feeble old man. He had contracted gout in consequence of a pilgrimage to a shrine of the Blessed Virgin, which he made barefoot through the snow. This caused him terrible pain, but his dull, pallid features never betrayed it, save by an involuntary twitching of the lips. A celebrated medal by Andrea Guazzalotti of Prato expresses in striking relief the worn, sickly features and dull eyes of his stern face.[23]

---

[21] Campanus, *Vita Pii II,* in Muratori, III, part 2, p. 974.

[22] Heinemann, *Aeneas Sylvius,* p. 2.

The organization of a Crusade against the Turks was one of his first cares. By the Bull *"Vocavit nos Pius"* (October 13th, 1458), he summoned all Christian rulers to meet at Mantua and there agree upon plans for the defense of Christian civilization; this Bull is a masterpiece of noble and moving eloquence. But the rulers of Europe no longer understood such language. A war undertaken for any other purpose than some immediate national advantage seemed meaningless to them. Pius II entered Mantua on May 27th, 1459. Eleven weeks passed without a single one of the great powers sending representatives to the congress; the ambassadors of France and England did not arrive until November; and when they were finally assembled, the Pope had great difficulty in raising the discussions to a loftiness befitting the cause for which he had summoned them.

France demanded that the Holy See should support the claim of its candidate, René of Anjou, to the throne of Naples; Bohemia set forth its complaints against Frederick III; the Germans complained of the increased taxes for the Crusade; Venice specified certain conditions for her participation in the enterprise and treated the affair as a business question. "You have fought well for your allies and subjects against the Pisans and Genoese, against emperor and king," said the Pope, addressing the Venetians; "but now, when you ought to fight for

---

[23] On the austerity of Pius II's private life, see Pastor, III, p. 31.

Christ against the infidels, you want to be paid."[24] But his words were unavailing; the Venetians persisted in their inadmissible demands. Finally consent was given in principle to a crusade for three years, and the Pope notified the Christian world of the fact by a Bull (January 14th, 1450). But he entertained no illusions. His last words to the congress were a prayer to God: "Almighty, eternal God, who hast deigned to redeem the human race by the precious blood of Thy beloved Son, . . . grant, we beseech Thee, that the Christian princes and nations may so valiantly take up arms against the Turks and other enemies of the Cross that they may be victorious."[25]

Another lofty aim of the Pope encountered no less formidable obstacles. From the outset of his pontificate, plans of reform were drawn up by the illustrious Cardinal Nicholas of Cusa and by the pious and learned Bishop of Torcello, Domenico de Domenichi. The vast project proposed by Nicholas of Cusa looked to a general reformation, from the humblest parish institutions to the papal curia, and even the supreme head of the Church.[26] Nothing escaped the searching eye of the experienced reformer of the Church in Germany, neither the management of church corporations, nor the conduct of hospitals, nor the sale of indulgences, nor the manufacture of relics, nor the system of prebends and benefices, nor the canonical regulations and ecclesiastical customs regarding the dress of the clergy and the recitation of the canonical hours, nor the abuses of the Roman curia, nor the personal duties of the sovereign pontiff. All the measures which were recommended called for a stricter observance of canonical regulations and the Christian spirit.

What especially distinguished the plan of Cardinal Nicholas of Cusa was the establishment of a corps of inspectors general, "chosen from the ranks of serious men, imitators of Christ, placing justice and truth above all else," who would be so placed as to have nothing to hope or fear from any one.[27] St. Antoninus of Florence, who had just published his celebrated *Summa* of Moral Theology, was called upon by the Pope for his advice on this plan of reform. A Bull was even prepared for the promulgation of the reform. But when on the point of taking the step, Pius II, foreseeing the formidable opposition he would encounter, recoiled and postponed the execution of his project.[28]

---

[24] Pastor, III, p. 85, who quotes *Pii II comment.*, p. 85.

[25] Pastor, III, p. 99.

[26] The manuscript of this remarkable document is preserved in the State Library at Munich.

Meanwhile he confined himself to the correction of the two abuses which had been the stumbling-blocks of his youth: pagan humanism and opposition to the rights of the Holy See. A large number of scholars, counting on his well-known taste for literary culture, looked forward to an era of favors and privileges at his coming. They were bitterly disappointed. Pius II did not fail to encourage art and letters; but, knowing from experience the fatal tendencies which then prevailed among the humanists, he showed himself very reserved in the matter of the patronage that was asked of him. Later on, some dissatisfied litterateurs made bold to remind him of his earlier sentiments on this matter; but he did not hesitate by a solemn Bull (April 26th, 1463) to retract his former errors in the presence of the Church: "Hear the word of Pius II," he said, "but reject that of Æneas Sylvius" (*Aeneam rejicite, Pium recipite*).

The Dauphin of France, the future Louis XI, before ascending the throne, promised Pius II to abolish the Pragmatic

---

[27] A summary of this project may be found in Pastor, III, pp. 271 sqq.

[28] In 1894, Emile Chénon wrote: "Callistus III and Pius II, in their preoccupations for the Eastern Church, forgot the reform of the Western Church." (Lavisse and Rambaud, *Histoire générale,* III, p. 342.) Recent scientific investigations in the Vatican Archives no longer permit this assertion to stand. See Celier, "*Alexandre VI et la réforme de l'Eglise*" in the *Mélanges de l'Ecole de Rome,* XXVII, pp. 65–124, and *Revue des Questions Historiques,* October 1st, 1909: "*L'idée de réforme à la cour pontificale du concile de Bâle au concile de Lateran,*" pp. 418–435.

Sanction of Bourges.[29] In the correspondence between the Pope and the King from the latter's coronation in 1461 to the Pope's death three years later, it is curious to follow the negotiations in which these two great statesmen measured their strength against each other, the monarch promising everything, but with such reservations and implications that he could use them as pretexts for neglecting his promise or for inserting new conditions, the Pope foiling these tricks with tireless skill and patience; Louis giving with one hand what he would take back with the other, Pius II slipping out of his grasp by an ever watchful policy.[30] In 1464, when there was question of two vacant benefices, Louis "requested the Pope to confer them upon Jean Balue, adding that this favorite had already taken possession of them, and that he would himself defend him against all opponents. Pius II refused, and asked the King if he would suffer any one to say to him, 'Give me this castle freely, or I will take it by force.' "

As the Pope grew older, his fearlessness seemed to increase. At times, when he suffered agonizing pains from gout and gall-stones, he could be seen nervously biting his lips, but with never a murmur. He wished, before dying, to give this fifteenth-century world, too much softened by humanism and too absorbed in its material prosperity, an example that would shake it out of its torpor and lead it towards heroism.

Venice, whose interests were endangered by the Turks, had concluded an offensive alliance (September, 1463) with Hungary against the infidels. The Duke of Burgundy promised his support. Upon learning this news, the Albanian hero Scanderbeg, whose very name made the Mussulmans tremble, began a campaign without waiting for the declaration of war. The Pope informed the Christian world that he himself would direct the crusade and would in person march against the Turks. On September 23rd, 1463, he said in the course of an address: "In vain have we cried: Go! Perhaps the cry: Come! will be more effective. Perhaps on seeing a frail, sickly old man, the Vicar of Christ, set out from Rome, Christian princes will be ashamed to remain at home."

---

[29] See his letter in *Opera Aeneae Sylvii,* Basle ed., p. 863.

[30] It is asserted that, in abandoning the Pragmatic Sanction, Louis XI flattered himself that he would win the Pope to the cause of the house of Anjou and would obtain the conferring of the chief benefices in the realm. (Pastor, III, p. 156.)

A month later he published a Bull in which he appealed to princes and people, not only as head of the Christian religion, but also as representing humanity, civilization, and liberty. From France, Germany, the Netherlands, Scotland, and Spain thousands of the common people set out for Rome to march with the Pope. But the princes and other notables did not share this enthusiasm. Pius II left the Eternal City (June 18th, 1464) and, after a pilgrimage to Assisi, reached Ancona July 19th, in a weak condition. His keenest suffering was the shame of seeing Christendom remain indifferent. Three weeks elapsed without any news of the Venetians. At length, on August 12th, word was brought to the Pope that the Venetian fleet was sighted. Despite the suffering which the least movement caused him, Pius had himself carried to a window overlooking the sea. At sight of the fleet, he said sadly: "Heretofore I lacked a fleet to set out. Now it is I who will be lacking to the fleet." He had only three days more to live. On the feast of the Assumption this great Pope who, even in his early straying, had always loved the Blessed Virgin, quietly breathed forth his soul to God. Although history cannot be unmindful of the grave failings of his youth, it should recognize the greatness of his pontificate.[31]

Paul II

Who would take up the heritage of Pius II? To continue the crusade, restrain pagan humanism, regulate with Louis XI the conditions for abrogating the Pragmatic Sanction of Bourges, and, if possible, carry out the plans of Nicholas of Cusa and Domenico de Domenichi for the reform of the Church, this was indeed a heavy task, considering the indifference and ill-will which the Holy See everywhere encountered. It was assigned to Cardinal Barbo, who took the name of Paul II (August 30th, 1464).

---

[31] Rudolf Wolkan has published a critical edition of the letters of Pius II in the *Fontes rerum austriacarum.*

The new Pope was sprung from a noble Venetian family, a nephew of Pope Eugene IV on his mother's side. He possessed an imposing appearance and distinguished manners and was a "grand seigneur" after the manner of the Venetian merchants, his ancestors, fond of magnificence and display without, however, suffering this defect to injure the purity of his morals, the sincerity of his faith, or the integrity of his government.

Although he did not bring to the war against the Ottomans his predecessor's chivalrous ardor, yet we find him making appeals and adopting numerous measures to gather the money and men needed for a new expedition. But his efforts were almost futile. Not a single European ruler was willing to go to the aid of the heroic Scanderbeg, who for two years had almost single-handed repulsed the repeated attacks of the Turkish forces. After the death of the Albanian hero, in 1468, Mahomet II, filled with confidence, thrust an army of 100,000 men into Greece, while Mahmoud Pasha took to sea with a fleet of almost 400 sails. Paul II repeated his appeal. He made it more pressing when, in July, 1470, the fall of Negropont threw all Italy into terror. It was now the turn of haughty Venice to tremble. But its tense relations with Germany and Hungary were unfavorable to a defensive entente for its advantage. Paul II formed another plan, that of an alliance with the chief of the Turcomans, Uzun Hassan, the avowed enemy of the Turks. The Pope's death, however, prevented his carrying out the plan.

In France, the tactics which Louis XI had employed in his negotiations with the former Pope were renewed with Paul II. He declared the Pragmatic Sanction abolished, but prevented the publication of the papal Bulls in France and threatened to call a council to depose the Pope. When he was reminded of the promises he had made to Pius II, he replied that they did not bind him to Paul II. The University of Paris, moreover, protested against the abolition of the Pragmatic Sanction.

The most distinguishing act of Paul II's pontificate was his energetic repression of the pagan and dissolute tendencies of humanism. He reformed the College of Abbreviators, which had been filled with arrogant humanists who asserted that "they gave the papal court a glory as great as that which they received from it." The "Roman Academy," founded by the humanist Pomponius Laetus, "with the aim of spreading a taste for pure Latinity," had become a meeting-place for suspected doctrines and improper ceremonies. The clues of a conspiracy were uncovered there, a plot to put the Pope to death and proclaim the Roman Republic. Paul II had the courage to attack the all-powerful humanists, dissolved the Academy, and arrested one of its leaders, Platina, the author of an odious pamphlet. The humanists took vengeance on the Pope by trying to blacken his memory. But it remains that of an upright and courageous pontiff.

Sixtus IV

Paul was found in his bedroom dying from a stroke of apoplexy, only a moment before he expired (July 26th, 1471). He was succeeded by Cardinal Francesco della Rovere, who took the name of Sixtus IV. A portrait by Melozzo da Forli represents him as a man with broad shoulders and a powerful head, his nose and forehead in a straight line, regular features, deeply wrinkled: his whole attitude indicates uncommon vigor, whereas the expression of his eyes reveals a generous, almost naïve kindliness. While still young he had entered the Franciscan Order, in which he passed the greater part of his life. The new Pope took no account of his personal needs, but gave with an open hand as long as he had anything to give. It was not long before all his relatives flocked about him to live on him and the Church. Once surrounded by this swarm of parasites, Sixtus IV seemed unable to shake them off or free himself from their exactions; he frequently entrusted responsible offices to them. This was his chief weakness.

His second mistake was his failure to discern clearly enough and to condemn without mercy, as most of his predecessors had done, the pagan elements of the Renaissance. By way of loving and praising the beautiful in art and literature, the Italian of the fifteenth century had come to consider beauty as an end in itself, justified for its own sake. So, too, by devoting himself passionately to military or political activity, he had come to consider the display of personal activity as an end in itself. There is no more morality in Machiavelli's *Principe* than in the *De voluptate* of the humanist Valla.[32] For the pagan humanist of this period, the keeping of an oath is stupid childishness in politics, as respect for modesty is stupid and childish in art.

It was into such surroundings that Francesco della Rovere entered upon quitting the cloister. These politicians and humanists he found among the men most in public favor, among the princes with whom he had to deal; he met them particularly in his own family. The most beloved of his nephews, Pietro Riario, "soon drew upon him the eyes of all Italy, partly by the fabulous luxury of his life, partly through the reports which were current of his irreligion and of his political plans." [33] This Pietro Riario regarded himself as free from all moral precept. When cardinalitial posts became vacant by the death of such men as the great Bessarion (d. 1472) and the ascetical Capranica (d. 1478), Sixtus IV replaced them by politicians and humanists. In the very first of his promotions were two of his nephews, Giuliano della Rovere and Pietro Riario, both of them very young, the second one notoriously unworthy.

---

[32] *The Prince,* by Machiavelli, was one of the first books placed on the Index by the Council of Trent.

Notwithstanding these defects, Sixtus IV's political achievements were not without glory. It was during his pontificate that the death of Mahomet II (1481) opened the way to a promising offensive by the Christian army; we see the Pope selling his personal plate to help defray the expenses of the crusade.[34] In 1482, the battle of Campo Morto, coming unexpectedly after deplorable divisions for which the famous Riario, one of the Pope's nephews, was largely responsible, strengthened the power of the States of the Church. In 1483, the peaceful intervention of St. Francis of Paula led King Louis XI to decide against the meeting of a schismatic council.[35]

In the matter of the Spanish Inquisition, the part of Sixtus IV was not so blameworthy as it is often represented. He instituted this tribunal (in 1478) only after the failure of gentler means, to put an end to the incessant disorders provoked by the exactions of falsely converted Jews and by popular reprisals against them. The object of the Inquisition was to end these disturbances by a more regular procedure. If he did not cure all the abuses of this mixed court,[36] in a country where passions were aroused to a high pitch, yet on many occasions he recommended equity and mildness. His appointment of the Dominican friar Thomas de Torquemada in 1483 as Grand Inquisitor was for the purpose of withdrawing the accused so far as possible from the violence of political parties.[37] As for the Pope's fostering protection of arts and letters, "in the history of intellectual culture the name of Sixtus IV must ever find an honorable place together with those of Nicholas V, Julius II, and Leo X. It may safely be said that, in regard to the development of the Renaissance in Rome, Sixtus IV occupies a position similar to that of Lorenzo de' Medici in Florence." [38]

---

[33] Burckhardt, I, p. 147.

[34] Cf. Pastor, IV, pp. 341, 346, where he refutes Gregorovius, who says that Sixtus IV obstinately confined himself to his territorial policy.

[35] Pastor, IV, p. 377.

[36] On the Spanish Inquisition, see Pastor, IV, pp. 397–404; Hefele, *The Life of Cardinal Ximenez*, pp. 272–400; Vacandard, *The Inquisition*, p. 197. Those Catholic apologists are mistaken who claim that the Spanish Inquisition was a purely political institution. See the refutation of this error in Pastor, *loc. cit.*

The misfortunes of his pontificate, which were especially those of his times and his relatives, were manifested in the famous conspiracy of the Pazzi. The arrogance of the Medici had long since aroused deep hatred, which was sure to break out sooner or later. The odious conduct of Lorenzo de' Medici, sacking the town of Volterra, appropriating the public revenues to his own use, seizing the chest containing money for the marriage portion of maidens,[39] carried the irritation beyond tolerable bounds. For men who had been feeding their minds with recollections of antiquity and for whom Brutus and Cassius were models, the suggestion was easy. It was well known how Giovanni Maria Visconti, the tyrant of Milan, had been assassinated in 1412, how the Chiavelli, tyrants of Fabriano, had perished in 1435, assaulted during high mass, and how even more recently, in 1476, Duke Galeazzo Maria Sforza had been slain in the Church of San Stefano. There were two factions of malcontents in Florence, the one gathered about the Pazzi, who represented the opposition of the old Florentine nobility against the capitalist aristocracy of the Medici, the other about Girolamo Riario, the Pope's nephew, who claimed to represent the interests of the Church. As a matter of fact, Lorenzo might well be considered the soul of all the intrigues against the Pope in Italy. "For any one in my position," he said, "the division of power is advantageous, and, if it were possible without scandal, three or four popes would be better than a single one." [40] He had no dread of schism.

---

[37] Torquemada has been freely calumniated. But his name does remain attached to the most rigorous period of the Spanish Inquisition. See Hefele, *op. cit.,* ch. 17 and 18. Under his direction, that is during twelve years, about two thousand persons were given to the flames. During that same period, fifteen thousand heretics were reconciled to the Church. Hefele, *op. cit.,* pp. 318 sqq.

[38] Pastor, IV, p. 432.

[39] *Ibid.,* V, p. 116.

It is related that when the Milanese conspirators decided to do away with Sforza, in 1476, they invoked the protection of St. Stephen.[41] The Florentine conspirators wished at least to be assured of the approbation of the head of the Church. We have an authentic account of the interview that took place on this occasion. "The Pope from the first declared that he wished for a change of government in Florence, but without the death of any man . . . 'On no condition will I have the death of any man' . . . Girolamo then said, 'What is possible shall be done to avoid such a casualty, but if it should occur, will your Holiness forgive its authors?' 'You are a brute,' rejoined Sixtus, 'I tell you I do not desire the death of any man.' " [42] Girolamo insisted no further and withdrew.

It was agreed that, as at Milan and Fabriano, the tyrant should be slain in church during high mass. About the middle of the ceremony, Bernardo di Bandini Baroncelli, one of the conspirators, leaped upon Giuliano de' Medici, crying: "Traitor!" and struck him with a dagger. Giuliano, riddled with the stabs of several knives, was left dead on the spot; but Lorenzo, thanks to his servants who parried the blows with their cloaks, was only slightly wounded and found refuge in the old sacristy of the cathedral.

---

[40] Archives of Florence, quoted by Pastor, IV, p. 300.

[41] Burckhardt, I, p. 81.

[42] Pastor, IV, p. 304.

The cruel Medici took his revenge on the innocent; the Pope then issued an excommunication against him; there followed a war with Tuscany. Undoubtedly the Pope was free from all suspicion of complicity in the crime; but for the honor of the papacy it is infinitely to be regretted that the name of Sixtus IV had been mixed up in the plot and that his nephew had been the instigator of such an outrage.

While his relatives so gravely compromised his authority, Sixtus IV, who had been a remarkable General of the Franciscans, was leading the private life of a true religious, laboring to restore the splendor of public worship, showing his zeal for liturgical music by founding the Sistine choir, encouraging devotion to the Blessed Virgin and the use of the rosary, and especially increasing his favors to the religious Orders. In 1484 he approved the severe rule of the Order of Minims, founded by St. Francis of Paula, favored the development of the Brethren of the Common Life, confirmed the Order of Discalced Augustinians, and granted a considerable extension of privileges to the Franciscans by the Bull *"Mare magnum"* and the *Golden Bull.*

Monks and Friars

We must needs take a view of the general state of monasticism at this period in order to understand the meaning and opportuneness of this Bull. Toward the end of the fifteenth century, the monasteries following the Benedictine rule had fallen from their ancient glory and primitive fervor. The more and more numerous exemptions of the great abbeys, their priories, provostships, and correctories, the chapters and parishes dependent on them and the monasteries affiliated to them, had withdrawn a considerable number of ecclesiastical institutions from the jurisdiction of the bishops and in more than one place had led to violent conflicts.[43] A reaction was urgently needed. Unfortunately it was sought to remedy one abuse by another still worse. *Exemption* was met by *commendation.*[44] The bishops, deprived of all jurisdiction over the abbeys and monasteries, had themselves invested, even though they were seculars, with the abbatial title, free to appoint a vicar for the government of the monks. The kings favored this practice which, under Louis XI, spread over France with amazing rapidity. The abbeys of Saint-Denis, Fecamp, Chaise-Dieu, most houses of the Order of Citeaux, in the middle of the fifteenth century were held *in commendam.*[45] Another evil completed the monastic decadence. The Bull of Benedict XII, which in 1336 so happily grouped the Benedictine houses into several provinces and thus gave effective cohesion to their efforts, had become a dead letter. There was no more common action, almost no general chapters.[46] Each major monastery, having recovered its autonomy, acted only for itself. Particularism had penetrated even into the organization of each community. Besides the collective income, particular incomes were established for the benefit of the priors, cellarers, or sacristans, assuring them of separate revenues. Each office became a benefice. Why should not a secular intrigue for it? The *commenda* offered him the means. In 1481, and again in 1486, the monks of Cluny complained of the increasing intrusion of seculars.[47] At the end of the fifteenth century the Apostolic spirit and zeal seemed to have taken refuge in the mendicant Orders—Friars Minor, Dominicans, Augustinians, Carmelites, and Minims.

---

[43] Imbart de la Tour, *Les origines de la réforme,* II, pp. 189–194.

[44] From the fourth century of the Church, we find the word *commenda* (from *commendare,* "to entrust") used to designate the act of entrusting a vacant benefice to the care of an administrator. This latter, if a layman, was to govern or manage only in temporal matters. This institution, very useful at the time of the barbarian invasions, gave place later on to serious abuses. (See Thomassin, *Ancienne et nouvelle discipline,* part 2, bk. 3, ch. 11, 21.)

[45] Imbart de la Tour, p. 198. On the growth of the *commenda* in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, see Thomassin, ch. 20, 21.

[46] On the Bull *"Summi Magistri"* of Benedict XII and its destinies, see Belière, *"Les chapitres généraux de l'ordre de saint Benoit,"* in the *Revue Bénédictine.* 1901–1902.

There it showed itself with intensity, at times with exuberance. By the enthusiasm which is privileged to the youth of institutions as to the youth of men, by the firmness of a hierarchy whose resources were by no means exhausted, by their very rules which, obliging them to live on alms, made them mingle daily with the people, the mendicants had become a great power, the great regenerating force of human society. The people called them to all its feasts and often commissioned them as interpreters of its demands. When they preached a mission, the town paid their expenses and turned all the police powers over to them.

The Bull *"Mare magnum"* of Sixtus IV, conferring on them the ordinary powers of preaching, hearing confessions, burying the dead, without recourse to the bishops, confirmed all these practices. It became the charter of the mendicant friars. But their apostolate was compromised by the exaggerations of some of their members, who considered themselves the special priests of the faithful, turned their chapels into parishes, and went so far as to claim they were superior to all other pastors of souls;[48] and they also suffered in public esteem by the rivalries that arose between the different mendicant Orders. Their influence was, nevertheless, very great. It was precisely by this Bull *"Mare magnum,"* which some historians so unfairly blame as excessive, that Sixtus IV most effectively labored for the reform of the Church. From the ranks of all these religious Orders, thus favored and encouraged, there arose, with an independence and assurance coming from this mark of confidence, the most zealous and effective preachers of the true reformation.[49]

---

[47] Statutes cited by Imbart de la Tour, II, p. 204.

[48] Brulefer (*In lib. IV sententiarum S. Bonaventurae,* lib. 4, dist. 17, fo. 484) says: *"Mendicantes . . . sunt proprii sacerdotes."* In 1482 a cordelier, Brother Langeli, declared that "the Mendicants are, far more than the parish priests, the pastors of souls." (Cf. Imbart de la Tour, II, 209.)

The picture of popular preaching in the fifteenth century forms one of the most characteristic and interesting episodes of the Renaissance. Leaving to ordinary preachers the care of setting forth the doctrines of religion, the missionary friars engaged solely in preaching a reform of morals. Sometimes in churches, but more usually in the open air, in the public square, before crowded and overflowing throngs and for hours at a time, the Franciscan, Dominican, Augustinian, or Servite friar would attack the evils of the time, accusing the great as well as the lowly, the rich no less than the poor, and would inveigh mightily against pagan immorality.

"The sermons," says Burckhardt, "were moral exhortations, free from abstract notions and full of practical applications, rendered more impressive by the saintly and ascetic character of the preacher. The most powerful argument used was not the threat of hell and Purgatory, but rather the living results of the '*maledizione*,' the temporal ruin wrought on the individual by the curse which clings to wrong-doing. The grieving of Christ and the saints has its consequences in this life. And only thus could men, sunk in passion and guilt, be brought to repentance and amendment—which was the chief object of these sermons . . . The most immediate consequences which follow from the preacher's denunciation of usury, luxury, and scandalous fashions, are the opening of the gaols—which meant no more than a discharge of the poorer debtors—and the burning of various instruments of luxury and amusement, whether innocent or not. Among these are dice, cards, games of all kinds, written incantations, masks, musical instruments, song-books, false hair, and so forth. All these would be gracefully arranged on a scaffold (*'talamo'*), a figure of the devil fastened to the top, and then the whole set on fire. Then came the turn of the more hardened consciences. Men who had long never been near the confessional, now acknowledged their sins. Ill-gotten gains were restored, and insults which might have borne fruit in blood retracted. Nor did the monks themselves scruple to attack princes, governments, the clergy, or even their own Order . . . In the Piazza del Castello at Milan, a blind preacher from the Incoronata—consequently an Augustinian—ventured in 1494 to exhort Ludovico Moro from the pulpit. There is no want of courageous reproofs addressed even to the Pope in his chapel." [50] Jacopo de Volterra cites a certain Father Paolo Toscanella, who, before the court of Sixtus IV, but in the accidental absence of the Pope, thundered against the Holy Father, his family, and his cardinals. When Sixtus learned of this, says Volaterrani, he merely smiled.[51]

---

[49] A Bull to reform the curia, prepared by Sixtus IV and entering into the most precise details, was never published. The text of this Bull is to be found in the national library at Munich.

The most celebrated of these orators were, among the Augustinians, Brandolini Lippi and Aegidius of Viterbo; among the Dominicans, Blessed Giovanni Dominici, John of Naples, and that astounding though sometimes vulgar Gabriel Barletta, a preacher possessing such great influence over the masses that a proverb arose: *"Qui nescit barlettare, nescit praedicare."* To put more life into his sermons, he even introduced dialogues: "You, bourgeois, are you a Christian?—Yes, Father; I was baptized in such and such a church.—What is your trade?—I practice usury.—Well, then, if we should put your wife's fine clothes into a press, we would squeeze out the blood of the poor!" [52] In France the Cordeliers

---

[50] Burkhardt, II, p. 271 and *passim.*

[51] Volaterrani, *Diarium Romanum,* in Muratori, XXIII, col. 173.

[52] Barletta, *Sermones,* fo. 48.

Maillard and Menot preached the most severe truths in a manner no less popular, sometimes even burlesque.

About 1460 the Dominicans devoted themselves more especially to theological study and thus left more room for the Franciscans. We have already mentioned St. Bernardine of Siena and St. John Capistran. Jacques de la Marche († 1476), Roberto of Lecce († 1483), Antoine de Verceil († 1483), Michele Carcano († c. 1485), Blessed Barbardino of Feltre († 1494), and Bernardine de Bustis († 1500) continued their work. In 1494 the Dominican Girolamo Savonarola took up the work of reform with incomparable success.

The labors of the sovereign pontificate ruined the robust health of Sixtus IV. He had an attack of fever in the middle of June, 1484. In the month of August, the defection of Ludovico the Moor, on whose support he counted, was a fatal blow for the Pope. He was heard to murmur: "Ludovico a traitor!" During the night his condition grew worse, and the next day, after receiving holy communion from the hands of his confessor, Blessed Amadeus of Portugal, he quietly breathed his last.

He who has been called "the terrible Sixtus IV," whose name, connected with memories of Torquemada and the Spanish Inquisition, has come down to us bearing the curse of more than one historian, does not deserve such a reputation. It is undeniable that in his public life Sixtus often gave the impression of a temporal monarch rather than of a pope, of a Maecenas lavishly bountiful towards literary folk rather than of a reformer of the children of the Church. There were undoubtedly about him plenty of suspicious plots, plenty of blood-spilling and civil war, and if such scandals were those of his time and his relatives rather than of his own person, nevertheless he made the great mistake of not stemming the tide of paganism, but rather opening wide the doors of the

Sacred College to its onrush, and of preparing in a certain measure for the reign of Alexander VI. But by the worthiness of his private life no less than by the intelligent impulse which he was able to give to the true classical renaissance, Sixtus IV deserves our homage. If he personally did little to reform the evils in the Church, yet by his lofty protection of the most active and austere religious Orders, he favored the recruiting of Apostolic workers who would labor for the true reformation.

Innocent VIII

Sixtus IV's death was followed by indescribable tumult. The wrath of the people, who had so long borne the yoke of the Pope's nephews, knew no bounds. The enraged populace rushed to the palace of Girolamo Riario, broke down the doors, sacked the whole place, and left only the walls standing. When this rage quieted down a bit, the conclave assembled. Cardinal Giuliano della Rovere, another of the dead Pope's nephews, aspired to the tiara. When he saw that he had no chance to obtain it, he resolutely entered upon intrigues to have a candidate of his own choice elected. The most dubious tactics were possible with men like Raffaele Riario, Ascanio Sforza, Rodrigo Borgia, and Orsini. Giuliano did not recoil before any form of corruption. The negotiations lasted throughout the night (August 28th, 1484) and ended with the written promise of Cardinal Giovanni Battista Cibo to meet all the wishes of his future electors. A few moments afterwards, Cardinal Cibo, the creature of Giuliano della Rovere, was elected pope. It was a triumph of the most shameless simony.[53]

The new Pope, who took the name of Innocent VIII, was descended from a noble Genoese family related to the Dorias.

---

[53] "The statements of the envoys referring to this matter can nearly all be proved correct." (Pastor, V, p. 238.)

In his youth he had lived licentiously at the court of the kings of Aragon. One son, Franceschetto, and one daughter, Theodorina, were the fruit of an illicit union. But it appears that after his ordination to the priesthood his private conduct was regular; and we get the same impression of his private life throughout his pontificate. But the fact that he stained himself with simoniacal intrigues to obtain the tiara characterized his morality.

Between the pontificate of Sixtus IV, which had a bright side, and that of Alexander VI, in which the very crimes were grandiose and dramatic in their atrocity, the pontificate of Innocent VIII contains little that is striking. He had at heart the material prosperity and good order of Rome and, though without result, assembled a congress for the purpose of organizing a crusade against the infidels. It was in his reign that baptized Jews of Spain, Maraños as they were called, assassinated the inquisitor St. Peter Arbues. King Ferdinand the Catholic summoned all the Israelites to be baptized or leave Spain within four months. A certain number of these exiled Jews betook themselves to Rome, where many of their coreligionists were living in peace. Some of the latter were found even in the papal chanceries. Innocent VIII, when he became aware of this scandal, corrected it.[54]

But under such a leader there could be no question of earnest and thorough reform. A Bull (December 5th, 1484) against practices of sorcery [55] and the condemnation of Pico della Mirandola's errors [56] are the principal documents that can be cited as evidence of this Pope's activity in the matter of reform.

More apparent is the supineness of his government. One of the great scandals of Innocent's pontificate was the solemn marriage of his natural son, Franceschetto, to the daughter of Lorenzo de' Medici in the papal palace. No doubt most of the nobles and dignitaries who were present had not much reason to be scandalized, so accustomed were they, since the days of Sixtus IV, to consider the pope as a temporal ruler. We know from Eneas Sylvius, moreover, that the greater number of reigning princes in his time had been born out of wedlock and that, when Pius II entered Ferrara in 1459, he was received by seven princes, of whom not a single one was the offspring of a licit union.[57] But it was the duty of the head of the Church, of the loftiest representative of Christ on earth, to protest by his example against such immorality.

---

[54] Pastor, V, p. 347.

[55] It is quite wrong to accuse Innocent VIII of having spread in the Christian world, by this Bull, a belief in sorcery. Many a trial for sorcery took place before that period. The Bull, moreover, possesses no dogmatic character.

[56] See Denzinger, nos. 736–737.

A still graver scandal—graver, that is, in the consequences that followed from it—appeared in the composition of the Sacred College. When Innocent VIII came into power, the College of Cardinals counted among its members Ascanio Sforza, who dazzled the world by the sumptuous retinue of his house where he entertained with nocturnal festivities, Ballue, a wealthy man of vast ambition, who at his death left a fortune of 100,000 ducats, and Rodrigo Borgia who, to everyone's knowledge, had illicit relations with a Roman woman, Vanozza Catanei. Under the new Pope the College of Cardinals acquired several other prelates no less suspect of worldliness and immorality.

On one occasion Innocent VIII promoted to the purple a natural son of his brother Lorenzo and a young son of Lorenzo de' Medici, Giovanni, barely seventeen years old. Lorenzo de' Medici, who had solicited this appointment with much insistence, when the time came for his young son to enter such an assembly, felt the old childhood sentiment of faith arise from the depth of his heart, along with the apprehensions of his paternal solicitude; he could not refrain from addressing a letter full of prudent advice to the young cardinal. "My son," he wrote, "you will not lack about you councillors, tempters, and envious persons, who will strive to drag you into the abyss into which they themselves have fallen. You should the more heartily undertake to confound these people, as the Sacred College is at present the more devoid of good qualities. I can remember seeing that college composed of men eminent in learning and virtue; you would do well to follow their example."

---

[57] Cited by Pastor, V, p. 114.

The preaching friars, however, continued to raise their voices against the evils of the times. In addition to Blessed Bernardine of Feltre and Bernardine de Bustis, there was heard another voice, more sonorous in its accents and more terrible in its threats: that of the Dominican Savonarola.

Savonarola

Girolamo Savonarola was born in 1452 of a noble family of Ferrara. In childhood he manifested an ardent and pensive nature. A Franciscan's sermon, which he heard at the age of twenty-three, prompted him to quit the world and dedicate himself to God. He entered the Order of St. Dominic. When departing from home, he left on his table a treatise, *On Contempt for the World,* full of invectives against a society which he had merely glimpsed at, and in which he had discovered only shame and crime. Before the end of the first year of his religious life, another work came from his pen, a poem *On the Decline of the Church,* in fiery verses that lashed the pride and cupidity which had penetrated into the very sanctuary. "What is to be done to avenge such iniquities?" asked the poet friar. A heavenly virgin answered him: "Keep silent and weep."

But he soon broke this silence. In 1482 Brother Savonarola was sent by his superiors to Florence to preach. Under the rule of Lorenzo de' Medici, Florence was the most worldly city of Italy. Pagan art and music had invaded even Christian temples. Vasari speaks of a picture of St. Sebastian, painted by Baccio, which was a real scandal in the church where it was exposed.[58] The humble friar, in going through the city, might have met on feast days, amidst a gallant cavalcade, a brilliant knight, having a precious sword hanging at his side, surrounded by masqueraders, singers, and mercenaries taken from the dregs of the *bravi;* this worldly knight was a cardinal of the Holy Roman Church.

It needed less than this to inflame the fiery Dominican's indignation. With abrupt eloquence, disdainful of literary ornamentation, with awkward and jerky gestures, and a strong harsh voice marked by the rough accent of Lombardy, Brother Girolamo thundered against the vices of the world. The Florentines, who were at that time tasting the harmonious and flowery speech of Fra Mariano, the eloquent Franciscan friend of the humanists, failed at first to appreciate the new missionary. But he did not for that reason leave off. Preaching a commentary on the Prophets and the Apocalypse, he readily departed from the habitual form of sermons. His discourses were largely made up of descriptions of the lax morals of the day, followed by biting invectives and terrible threats. It was especially during two missions which he preached near Siena, in 1485 and 1486, that the peculiar genius of his harangues and the inspired prophetic tone of his words were developed.

When Savonarola returned to Florence, in 1490, to give a series of sermons on the Apocalypse from the pulpit of San Marco, the power of his eloquence, now riper and more confident, conquered his hearers. A sudden change took place. The churches could no longer hold the crowds thronging about his pulpit. That sallow complexion, that bony frame, that eagle

[58] Vasari, *Lives of Seventy of the Most Eminent Painters, Sculptors, and Architects,* III, p. 74.

nose, those gleaming eyes, those rapid and cutting gestures of a skinny hand, which had made his first hearers smile, now captivated the people; when his emotional voice announced the great punishment of the Church, the gathering burst into tears. The most pagan of the humanists came to hear him and often went away striking their breasts, like that painter Baccio, the sensual author of the St. Sebastian of Florence, who was converted by Brother Girolamo and became the great Christian artist, Fra Bartolommeo. Lorenzo de' Medici himself, whose soul had a depth of generosity, testified his esteem for the ardent Dominican and, had it not been for the uncompromising impetuosity of the monk, might have been converted by him.[59]

Fra Savonarola often presented his threats under the form of visions and prophecies; and he seems to have believed in the authenticity of his office of seer and prophet. During Advent, 1492, he declared that he had heard a voice of thunder coming from heaven and saying: "The sword of the Lord is threatening the earth." Then there fell, he said, a shower of swords in the midst of flaming air, and the most terrible evils spread upon the earth. Six months afterward, Pope Innocent VIII, after asking his cardinals' pardon for not having attained the height of his too heavy task and after receiving the holy viaticum with tears in his eyes, breathed his last (July 25th, 1492). To replace him, the eyes of the Sacred College turned to Rodrigo Borgia.

---

[59] It is certain that, in 1492, Lorenzo de' Medici, on his deathbed, sent for Savonarola. As to the fact that Savonarola imposed on him as a penance that he give Florence her liberty and as to Lorenzo's refusal, see Villari, *Life and Times of Girolamo Savonarola,* I, pp. 148, 168 sq.; Perrens, *Jérome Savonarole,* pp. 64-67. In the present state of critical study it seems impossible to affirm anything about the matter with certainty.

CHAPTER VIII

1492–1503

Alexander VI

At the close of a seven-day conclave, during which intrigue and bargaining entered into agreements and combinations of all sorts, Cardinal Rodrigo Borgia, whose irregular life was known to all, became the choice of the Sacred College.[1] Paganism, after having invaded the Roman Curia, at length ascended the very throne of St. Peter.[2]

It is surprising that in the official reports of ambassadors and in the chronicles of the time this election is mentioned without the least allusion to the morals of the newly elected Pope. This very absence of scandal is perhaps the greatest scandal of all. The sacred character of the loftiest ecclesiastical offices seemed to be veiled from the eyes of contemporary historians and statesmen; they judge a cardinal's or a pope's life as they would that of a temporal prince, and the indulgent tolerance of worldly opinion, which is almost unbounded for whatever concerns the private life of the great, quite naturally was extended to the pope himself.

Cardinal Rodrigo Borgia was not without the natural qualities that befit a statesman. Hartmann Schedel speaks of the new Pope as "a large-minded man, gifted with great prudence, foresight, and knowledge of the world." Thanks to his widespread acquaintance with men, he appeared conspicuously suited to be a ruler. It could be said in his praise that there was something lofty and superb in his very appearance.[3]

---

[1] He was of Spanish origin, born in 1430 or 1431 at Jativa, about thirty-four miles from Valencia. Through his father he belonged to the Lenzuoli family, and through his mother to the Borja, or Borgia. He took this latter name when his maternal uncle, Callistus III, was elected pope.

[2] The acts of simony attaching to the election of Alexander VI, have at times been doubted or denied. Leonetti, *Papa Alessandro VI,* I, p. 60; Cerri, *Borgia ossia Alessandro VI,* p. 94; Nemec, *Papst Alexander VI,* p. 81; *Revue des Sciences Ecclésiastiques,* XIV, p. 141; *Rassegna Nazionale,* X, p. 133. But the documents which Pastor, (V, p. 382) has brought to light on this subject admit of no reply.

The people acclaimed him with splendid ovations. Hieronymus Portius wrote: "He is tall, in complexion neither fair nor dark; his eyes are black, his mouth somewhat full. His health is splendid, and he has a marvelous power of enduring all sorts of fatigue. He is singularly eloquent in speech." [4] Another contemporary says that "he was exceptionally affable in conversation and admirably skilled in financial matters." [5]

The beginning of Alexander's pontificate did not disappoint the hopes generally placed in him. Preliminary to any internal reform of the Church, there was a political task to be undertaken: to assure the papacy's independence of the Roman factions and Italian tyrants. To this task the new Pope devoted himself with all the energy of which he was capable. In the short interval between the last relapse of Innocent VIII and the coronation of his successor, more than 220 murders had been committed. Alexander ordered a thorough investigation, appointed commissioners to receive complaints from the inhabitants, gave audiences himself to all who had any claims to present to him.[6] At the same time he reorganized the finances, reduced the expenses of the papal court, and kept such a frugal table that the cardinals eschewed his invitations to dinner.[7]

---

[3] Schedel, *Chronic. chronicar.*, quoted by Pastor, V, p. 395.

[4] *Ibid.*, V, p. 388.

[5] Sigismondo dei Conti da Foligno, *Le storie de suoi tempi*, II, pp. 53, 268, 270.

[6] Infessura, *Diario della città di Roma*, p. 282, in Tommasini, *Fonti per la storia d'Italia*, and Muratori, *op. cit.*, III, part 2.

[7] The Ferrarese ambassador wrote to his master in 1495 as follows "He [the Pope] partakes of but a single dish, though this must be a rich one. It is, consequently, a bore to dine with him. Ascanio and others, especially Cardinal Mon-

Amid the petty, jealous, turbulent, independent, constantly warring states of which Italy was composed, Rome and the papal domain had much to fear. The Pope used his first available funds to strengthen his strongholds. He fortified Civitavecchia. In May, 1493, the expenses for military purposes reached 26,383 ducats.[8] Whenever the Italian States were at strife, the weaker ones were accustomed to summon foreign aid. The foreigner was the emperor of Germany or the king of Spain or the king of France. In 1492 one of the most dreaded soldiers of fortune in Italy, Ludovico Sforza, whose sun-burnt complexion had won him the name of Ludovico the Moor, proposed to King Charles VIII of France "a secret and private league." [9] But Alexander was on the watch. In April, 1493, he was at the head of a league which rallied Venice, Milan, Ferrara, and Mantua about the Holy See.[10]

Even in carrying out this purely political undertaking, the Pope's moral defects were an obstacle and we soon behold so great talents and efforts lead, not to independence, but to absolutism under the brutal hand of Caesar Borgia, his third son.[11]

His Nepotism

Not satisfied with continuing his dissolute habits after his election to the sovereign pontificate,[12] Alexander VI had an

---

reale, who formerly were his Holiness' table companions, and Valenza too, broke off this companionship because his parsimony displeased them, and avoided it whenever and however they could." (Gregorovius, *Lucretia Borgia,* p. 94.)

[8] Pastor, V, p. 407.

[9] Lemonnier in Lavisse, *Histoire de France,* V, part I, p. 25.

[10] Burchard, *Diarium,* II, p. 67; Infessura, p. 284; Pastor, V, p. 408.

[11] Caesar is often given as Alexander's second son. He was, in fact, the third. See Pastor, V, p. 364.

[12] Before his elevation to the pontificate, Rodrigo Borgia had, of Vanozza de Cataneis, four children: Juan, Caesar, Jafre, and Lucretia; and of another woman he had Pedro, Luis, and Girolama. He later had two more sons, Juan about 1497 and Rodrigo in 1503. The eldest of Alexander's sons was Pedro, who died about 1490. For further information as to the children of Alexander, see Pastor, V, p.

unbounded affection for his illegitimate offspring, who were placed in high office by him and who even formed his pontifical family. We see him sacrifice everything to assure the most advantageous and lucrative offices to his children, his relatives, and those connected with them by marriage; in fact to all who were attached to the Borgia family. The Pope was surrounded by this swarm of parasites whose cupidity formed a common bond. The nepotism of Callistus III was now surpassed. "Ten papacies," wrote Gianandrea Boccario three months after Alexander's accession, "would not have sufficed to provide for all these cousins." [13] The Sacred College was presently filled with favorites whose lives were like unto his own. Cardinal Peraudi said to the Florentine envoy: 'When I think of the lives of the Pope and some of the cardinals, I shudder at the idea of residing at the Court." [14]

There were no bounds to the Pope's passionate attachment to his daughter Lucretia, whom, during an absence from Rome, he even entrusted with the government of the Apostolic Palace,[15] and to his son Caesar, who was the pride of his life. Never could he refuse anything to Lucretia's smiling gaiety, and he was always subdued by the imperious dominance of his son Caesar. This son was his father's evil genius. He was taciturn, impenetrable, always wore a mask to hide, so it was said, the purulent spots of a shameful disease,[16] and was endowed with such herculean strength that he was known to have cut off the head of a powerful bull at a single stroke of the

---

363. Leonetti (*Papa Alessandro VI*) and Ollivier (*Le Pape Alexandre VI et les Borgia*) have tried to exculpate Alexander from the charge of immorality. But they have been refuted by H. de l'Epinois (*Revue des Questions Historiques*, 1881, vols. XXIX and XXX) and Pastor. Cf. *Civiltà Cattolica*, 8th ser., vol. IX, March 15, 1873, and Paquier, *Dict. de théol.*, under the word "*Alexandre VI.*"

[13] Pastor, V, p. 398, according to a document of the consistorial archives.

[14] Quoted by Pastor, V, p. 492.

[15] This excessive attachment led to odious calumnies, from which the Protestant historian Gregorovius has vindicated the memory of Alexander VI and Lucretia Borgia. (See Gregorovius, *op. cit.*)

[16] Pastor, *Histoire des papes*, (French trans.) V, p. 388.

sword. He was usually accompanied by his confidential assassin, Don Michelotto.[17]

Manifestly such a pope was unfit to labor for the reform of the Church. He had need to begin by reforming himself. Alexander had another defect: his election had been simoniacal. The very men against whom he should have turned with severity were ready to reproach him to his face with that crime. Savonarola did not fail to do so.

This impotence of the papacy led the people to turn their eyes, in the hope of reform, toward some powerful king or mysterious prophet. Hence, the welcome given in Italy to King Charles VIII and especially to the friar Savonarola.

King Charles VIII of France

At the death of King Ferrante of Naples, in 1494, Charles VIII usurped the throne and threatened the Pope to call a council if the Holy See should uphold the claims of his rival, Alfonso. To help realize his scheme, the King of France made sure of the alliance of the Colonna family and of Cardinal Giuliano della Rovere. The latter was Alexander's most powerful foe, succeeding him under the name of Julius II. Through the good offices of Giuliano, other cardinals were won, with whose assistance it might be possible to call a council and depose the Pope as guilty of simony. Public sympathy would be gained by finally accomplishing the reform of the Church. But so deep and vast a reform, carried out by this poor king, whose mind was as misshapen as his body, whom the Florentine Della Casa declared to be "an incapable monarch, influenced by the first comer," and by that worldly, ambitious, irascible cardinal who bore on his body the marks of the same shameful disease as Caesar Borgia,[18] was a thoroughly chimerical scheme. But

---

[17] On Caesar Borgia, see Burckhardt, vol. I.

[18] Pastor, *Histoire des papes,* (French trans.) V, p. 388.

Alexander VI was frightened. In June, 1494, Cardinal Sforza wrote to his brother: "The Pope is in the greatest alarm at the efforts of Cardinal Giuliano to support the calling of a council." [19]

Alexander received the French King's ambassadors with every possible courtesy and consideration, hoping in this way to pacify their master. Charles VIII, however, was too deeply plunged into his ambitious enterprises to withdraw. It was said that he aimed at the conquest of the kingdom of Naples "so as to squeeze Italy as in a vice between old France and his new possession, reduce the papacy to the position of a French dependency, and rise to be the master of Europe." It was also said that the Italian war was "the fatal consequence of an attraction which held sway over the minds of French kings for two centuries and kept their eyes turned towards the peninsula." [20] Statesmen who were responsible for the French policy took account of the situation: many Italians, tired of the state of anarchy and political collapse in which they were living and impatient to see a reform in the Church, were ready to welcome anyone who would present himself as a liberator and reformer.

The French army met so little resistance on its way that Philippe de Commines on several occasions expressed his astonishment: "God himself," he wrote, "is protecting our expedition!" Scarcely had the French set foot in Tuscany, when Savonarola, from the pulpit of the Florence cathedral, cried out: "The sword has come! The prophecies are being fulfilled; it is the Lord who leads these armies!" On November 9th, the Florentines arose with the cry of "The people and liberty!" Piero de' Medici took to flight. To save the city, Savonarola hastened to the French camp and, standing before the King, addressed these words to him in resonant voice and prophetic tone: "Most Christian King, God sends you to reform the Church, which lies prostrate. But if you are not just, if you respect not the city of Florence, the Lord will lay a heavy hand upon you." Charles VIII had a great veneration for the friar who had announced his coming and foretold his success. He promised to respect Florence, its women, its citizens, its liberty;[21] the city was adorned with flags and welcomed the King of France with cries of "Viva Francia!" when he made his entry on November 17th.[22]

---

[19] A letter in cypher, published by Pastor, *History of the Popes*, V, p. 426.

[20] Delaborde, *Expédition de Charles VIII en Italie.*

Two days later Rome itself was surrounded and cut off. From his windows Alexander could see the horses of the French army galloping to and fro outside the city walls. He retired to the Vatican with his faithful Spanish guard. The fear of a coming council, convoked by the King of France and deposing him as simoniacal, must have disturbed him more than ever. In reality, Charles VIII had not the ambition credited to him, because he did not feel the power to attain it. "He was a young man," says Commines, "and incapable of performing so important a work as the reformation of the Church."[23] But he profited by the panic and increased his threats. The Pope agreed (January 15th, 1495) to sign a treaty of peace containing hard conditions, for they obliged him to respect the possessions and benefices of his foes, notably of Cardinal Giuliano della Rovere. But the gravest of all his fears had been allayed: he was officially recognized by the King of France.

The impatient partisans of reform who had placed their hope in Charles VIII were dissatisfied. At Siena, Savonarola inveighed against the King: "Most Christian Prince," said he, "thou hast provoked the Lord to anger by breaking faith with the Florentines, by forsaking the task of reforming the Church . . . Shouldst thou fail to resume thy abandoned task . . .

---

[21] Villari, *Savonarola,* I, p. 226.

[22] *Ibid.,* I, p. 232; Delaborde, p. 447.

[23] Commines, *Memoirs,* II, p. 158.

still heavier woes shall be poured on thee by His wrath."[24]

The French, however, gratified with their easy victory in Italy, amused themselves, organized jousts and festivities, when of a sudden the States of the peninsula arose. In the doge's palace at Venice, a league was signed (April 1st, 1495), including the Pope, the Emperor, the King of Spain, Ludovico the Moor who resumed the title of King of Naples, and the Republic of Venice. The French King might well cry out: "It is a great shame!" After the battle of Fornovo, he lost no time in regaining France. He brought back from this expedition, says Commines, "only glory and smoke." As for the faithful, who, like Savonarola, were hoping for a reform of the Church through a change in the government of Italy, they were completely disappointed.

Alexander again took up his struggle against the Italian nobility. Unhappily this was a new occasion for the Pontiff to heap riches and honors on his relatives. To fight the powerful Orsini family, he summoned his son Juan, duke of Gandia. But the latter was quite incompetent. Having been appointed captain general of the papal forces, he allowed his army to be cut to pieces. The Pope then invested him with the duchy of Benevento, thus alienating a domain of the Church in Juan's favor. Prudent and pious men groaned. "If God does not reform His Church," wrote Cardinal Peraudi, "I despair of the future."[25]

Murder of the Duke of Gandia

There was indeed need for reform. At the very time Peraudi wrote his sad reflection (June 8th, 1497), the Pope appointed Caesar Borgia as ecclesiastical legate to Naples and commissioned him to represent the Holy See at the coronation of the new king. The Borgia family dominated Italy and blusteringly gloried in its power.

---

[24] Villari, II, p. 11; Commines, bk. 8, ch. 3.

[25] Thuasne, *Burchardi diarium*, II, p. 668.

Six days later was enacted a mysterious drama, which caused Caesar Borgia to be suspected—though it would seem mistakenly—of not stopping even at fratricide to make sure his right of primogeniture and thereby, murmured some of his enemies, of the succession to the papal throne.

On June 14th, Caesar Borgia had supper with his brother, the Duke of Gandia, his cousin Cardinal Juan Borgia, and several friends at the house of his mother, Vanozza, in the vicinity of San Pietro in Vincoli. About midnight the two brothers mounted their mules and set out for the papal palace. Near the Cesarini palace, the Duke of Gandia took leave of his companions. He was seen going away, followed by a squire and a masked man whom he had brought to the banquet; then he disappeared into the night. The following morning, in the same locality, the squire was found covered with wounds and unable to speak. As for the Duke, he had disappeared. They found only his mule and his stirrups bent out of shape. In the evening a wood-merchant related that about two o'clock in the morning he had seen a horseman, escorted by four men, advance to the bank of the Tiber and throw a body into the stream. On the 16th, some boatman drew out of the water the mutilated corpse of the Duke of Gandia, pierced with nine deep wounds. While common rumor accused the Orsini, some suspected Cardinal Sforza, and others attributed the outrage to the vengeance of some jealous Roman whose home had been dishonored by the Pope's son. The Venetian Dono Capello wrote with rash recklessness: "It is Caesar who threw his brother into the Tiber after cutting his throat." A German historian, Gregorovius, accepted this last supposition. But to-day it is universally abandoned. The more probable opinion is that the Duke of Gandia, whose misconduct was notorious, was the victim of an ambush in one of his escapades.[26]

The Pope was deeply affected. For three days he did not leave his room, weeping and refusing all food. "We would give seven tiaras," he said, "to be able to recall him to life." In a letter to the King of Spain, he spoke of abdication.[27] But Ferdinand dissuaded him from this desperate plan. He then took a more manly and Christian resolve. To the cardinals and ambassadors he announced: "We, on our part, are resolved to amend our own life and to reform the Church." [28]

On June 19th, Alexander appointed a commission of cardinals charged with the duty of preparing a scheme of reform. At the beginning of August, the Pope was the first to give the example: he declared that he would no longer tolerate about him either his children or nephews, and he sent even his daughter Lucretia to Valencia. Then the drafting of a mighty Bull of reform quite absorbed him.[29]

"By the providence of God," he says, "we have been raised on the watch-tower of the Apostolic See in order that in one measure we should exercise our pastoral office by removing what is bad and promoting what is good. Therefore, with our whole soul we desire an amendment in morals. . . . We mean to begin with the reform of our own court, which is composed of members of all Christian nations and should be an example of virtue to all. For the inauguration of this most necessary and long desired work, we have selected six of the best and most God-fearing of the cardinals. With their assistance we publish the following ordinances."

---

[26] Caesar's guilt, admitted by Gregorovius (*Lucretia Borgia,* p. 106), is denied by Leonetti (*Papa Alessandro VI*), Maury (*Revue Historique,* XIII, p. 87), H. de l'Epinois (*ibid.,* p. 403), Balan (*Storia d'Italia,* p. 372), Reumont (*Geschichte der Stadt Rom,* III, p. 225), Hoefler (*Rodrigo de Borgia,* p. 79), Brosch (*Alexandre VI,* pp. 370, 372), and Pastor (V, pp. 497, 512). Except Gebhart (*Revue des Deux Mondes,* LXXXIV, p. 918) and *Histoire générale* of Lavisse and Rambaud (IV, p. 15), no modern historian sustains the opinion of Gregorovius. Caesar, who was on the road to the highest honors, had nothing to gain by slaying his brother. On the contrary, he had every reason to fear the consequences of such a crime. The supposition that he thus was clearing the way to the papacy is most unlikely, as he was, at that very time, entertaining the idea of quitting the clerical state, a project that he carried out soon after.

[27] A letter of Lod Carissimi (August 8th, 1492) which was first published by Pastor, V, p. 500.

[28] Report of the Venetian ambassador, quoted by Pastor, V, p. 500. Cf. Sanudo, *I diarii,* I, p. 653.

[29] Some extracts from this Bull were found in the secret papal archives and published by Pastor (*History of the Popes,* V, pp. 514 sqq. and appendix 41).

After this preamble, the Pope takes up the regulation of divine service in the papal chapel, decrees severe measures against simony, provides at length for the reform of the College of Cardinals and officials of the court. "We see in all these prescriptions the result of Alexander's experience in the vice-chancellorship. He knew what bitter feelings had been aroused in all parts of the world by the corrupt practices of the secretaries of the court." [30]

This Bull never advanced beyond the status of a project. With the lapse of time, the grief and remorse in Alexander's soul gradually faded away. The unfortunate Pontiff did not possess the strength of will to break completely with so scandalous a past as his, with so many and so captivating attachments. Once the first emotion had passed, he yielded: the demons of voluptuousness and ambition again took up their sway over his soul and "his last state became worse than the first."

Caesar again took his place at court, the more exacting as his situation had for a moment been the more endangered. It soon became known that he was going to quit the purple and wed a princess. In December, 1487, Lucretia obtained a declaration of nullity of her marriage to Giovanni Sforza. There was nothing which the Pope was not ready to grant his sons: he had become their slave. Nasty rumors were in circulation concerning the Borgia house, even to the point of an accusation of "an unmentionable crime," [31] false though it was.

---

[30] Pastor, V, p. 518.

[31] Gregorovius, p. 109. We saw above that Gregorovius regarded as pure calumny the charge of incest against the Pope.

Popular report spoke of strange manifestations of the powers of darkness. Some there were who declared that on June 14th, 1497, they had seen torches flitting hither and thither in the interior of St. Peter's basilica, carried by invisible hands. Unusual noises, it was said, were heard in the churches. Was it not a significant manifestation of the powers of darkness that, on October 29th, lightning struck the powder magazine of Castel Sant' Angelo and shattered the statue of St. Michael? [32] Such a state of mind favored the success of the new prophet in Florence, from whom alone the great reformation was now expected.

Savonarola

Since the ocupation of Florence by the French and the abandonment of the city by the Medici, its condition had become lamentable. The Florentines, suddenly finding themselves free and masters of themselves, fell into a sort of confusion and disorder: a disorder which seemed the more hopeless as a young school of politics, later represented by the celebrated names of Machiavelli and Guicciardini, was elaborating, in all the effervescence of its formation, the most diverse and rash conceptions.

By the very force of things, the popular preacher of the San Marco monastery was led to speak of what was occupying everyone's mind. Savonarola at first hesitated, undecided. "O my people," he said, "thou knowest that I have always refrained from touching on the affairs of the state; thinkest thou that I would enter on them at this moment, did I not deem it necessary for the salvation of souls?" [33] On December 12th, 1494, he entered the domain of politics and set forth the following principles: "An absolute monarchy is the best of all governments under a good prince, but the worst under a bad one. . . . These principles should be modified according to the nature of the people to whom they are applied. Among northern nations, where there is great strength and little intellect, and among southern nations, where, on the other hand, there is great intellect and little strength, the rule of a single despot may sometimes be the best of governments. But in Italy, and above all in Florence, where both strength and intellect abound, where men have keen wits and restless spirits, the government of one can only result in tyranny. . . . Your reform must begin with spiritual things." [34] In connection with this last principle, the "prophet," as he was commonly called, indignantly inveighed against the famous saying of Cosimo the Elder, that "States are not governed by Pater Nosters."

---

[32] Thuasne, *Burchardi diarium,* II, p. 411.

[33] Sermon XIII, in Villari, I, p. 262.

In his sermons on the Psalms, which he began preaching on January 6th, 1495, political advice is mingled with religious counsel. It was in accordance with Savonarola's recommendations that the arbitrary imposts of 1427 were replaced by a new tax of ten per cent. on real estate and that the court of the Mercananzia (Commerce) was reorganized. The drafting of a new code of commerce was due to his initiative. In December, 1495, he had a monte di pietà (pawnshop) established.

We find him employing words of extreme violence against tyranny and anarchy, which he considered closely related. "Tyrant," he said, "is the name of a man who leads a detestable life. A tyrant is ruled by pride, lust, and greed. A tyrant contains within him all the vices that man is capable of; all his senses are corrupted: his ears by flattery, his taste by gluttony, his eyes by indecency. Public offices he buys, orphans he robs, and the people he oppresses. And you, fellow citizen, who are in subjection to him, are no less wretched than he is: your tongue is enslaved when speaking to him; your eyes are enslaved when looking at him; your property is his; and, if he strikes you, you must forsooth, say: 'Thanks!'" [35]

---

[34] Villari, I, p. 261.

Savonarola hated no less the Florentine practice according to which at certain times the people, summoned by the bell, met together unarmed in the public square to pass laws. Such a meeting was called the *parlamento*. In reality, under this appearance of liberty, the people became a docile tool in the hands of a few powerful and ambitious citizens. Nothing could equal the friar's vehemence when speaking of the *parlamento*. "Come forward, my people! Art thou not sole master now?—Yes!— . . . Keep ye this in mind and teach it to your children. And thou people, at the stroke of the bell calling thee to Parliament, rise and draw thy sword. . . . If he that would summon a Parliament be of the Signory, let his head be cut off; if he be not of it, let him be proclaimed a rebel and all his goods confiscated. . . . Should the Signory seek to call a Parliament, the instant they set foot on the ringhiera, they shall no longer be considered the Signory, and all may cut them to pieces without sin." [36]

What, then, was the authority which the ardent preacher wanted to establish at Florence? On Palm Sunday, 1496, he set it forth clearly. After an eloquent discourse, the friar held up a crucifix before the people, saying: "Florence, behold the King of the world! He wishes to be your King. Do you want Him?" An immense acclaim was his reply. When the preacher left the pulpit, many burst into tears. From that moment Christ was the King of Florence. The Florentine government had this memorable inscription carved above the door of the palace where it resided: *"Jesus Christus, Rex florentini populi senatusque decreto electus"* (Jesus Christ, King by the will of the people and senate of Florence.)

---

[35] Sermon preached February 25th, 1496.

[36] Villari, I, p. 292.

From this moment onward, the influence of Savonarola, speaking in the name of Christ the King, was unbounded. If he preached against the luxury of the age or the paganism of art, the people came in throngs to cast at his feet musical instruments, pictures, poems, perfumes, cloth of rare texture, and rich lace. The ardent Dominican, repeating a spectacle that many missioners had enacted before him, made a bonfire of all these objects of vanity: it was what they called the *brucciamento delle vanità,* the "bonfire of vanities." During the carnival of 1497, he constructed in the Piazza della Signoria a huge octagonal pyramid, 150 feet high and 600 feet wide. On fifteen steps were placed the objects brought by the inhabitants of Florence: harps, lutes, viols, guitars, perfumes, pomades, and cosmetics, works of pagan poets and frivolous humanists, indecent pictures of the young Florentine school. At the foot of the pyramid were heaped twigs, tow, and gunpowder. A band of children dressed in white went in procession around the monument, singing canticles. Then, at a given signal, the four corners of the "bonfire of vanities" were lighted. When the first flame and smoke shot heavenward, the bells began to ring, the trumpets of the Signory resounded, and a tremendous shout of triumph came from all throats, as if the empire of Satan had been annihilated.

Savonarola's influence had not failed to stir up violent rivalry about him and his ardent disciples. Not counting the followers of the Medici and those devoted to the Franciscans, who rallied about Fra Mariano, a new party was formed, that of the *Arrabiati,* "the enraged," ready to dare anything against the ardent Dominican. Songs, sonnets, pamphlets, in prose and verse, all were used to attack the preacher.

The Friar of San Marco, urged by his disciples, the *Frateschi,* who formed a perpetual guard about him and had a sort of worship for him, being carried away by his impetuous temperament, did not always preserve due moderation in his words and deeds. His moral preaching became more and more exacting, going so far as to require people of the world to observe the strictest rules of monastic life; we see him forcing women into the convents in spite of their husbands' unwillingness. Some of the youth devoted to him went from street to street, entered private houses, overturned gaming tables, smashed harps and other musical instruments, and reported to Savonarola the names of offenders, who were always punished with severity.[37] A vast inquisition enveloped the city of Florence. Savonarola's great mistake in his reformatory efforts was to attack at one and the same time all the existing abuses and to try to abolish them without any transition or period of preparation.

His invectives became more and more frequent and vehement. So long as they were addressed only to the tyrants and demagogues whose crimes were so great in that Italy of freebooters and *bravi,* the friar could be blamed only for a certain excess of language. But, as we know, the abuses had another center, loftier than that. The impassioned apostrophes of the daring orator soon mounted the papal throne. "If he who sits on the chair of Peter," he said, "is found to be in manifest opposition to the law of the Gospel, I will say to him: 'You are not the Roman Church; you are but a man and a sinner.'" He maintained that, as Alexander's election was null because tainted with simony, the orders of Rodrigo Borgia had no authority to bind him, and he appealed to a general council. The Pope forbade him to preach; Savonarola at first submitted, then disobeyed the command. He wrote to the Pope (March 18th, 1498): "Being no longer able to hope for anything from your Holiness (for the reform of the Church), I must needs now address myself to Him who makes use of what is weakest on earth to confound the power of perverse men. Let your Holiness think of your salvation without further delay." Shorty after, he asked the kings of France, Spain, and England, and the Emperor of Germany to call a general council. But his letter to Charles VIII was intercepted and at once dispatched to the Sovereign Pontiff. Alexander VI had now in his hands an authentic document showing how far the audacity of the rebel friar might go.[38]

---

[37] Pastor, V, p. 205.

The group of Savonarola's enemies was increased by the addition of all those whom his word or attitude had offended: lords, humanists, condottieri, wealthy burghers, whose paganism or luxury he had criticized. Popular songs made fun of him.[39]

An unfortunate incident soon completely ruined the friar's popularity. Savonarola's enemies, who bore it ill that Alexander VI was so forbearing,[40] resolved to precipitate the issue.

In various sermons, notably in one preached March 8th, 1496, the Dominican recalled that more than once the will of God had been made known by the judgment of fire.[41] About the beginning of 1498 he proposed that he and his adversaries should go to some elevated place and there ask God to send fire from heaven upon those who taught false doctrines. Not long after this, some of the *Arrabiati* urged a Franciscan friar,

---

[38] Several letters, written to the Emperor and the King of France, urging them to convoke a council against the Pope, have been published by Baluze (*Miscellanea,* I, p. 583). The letter from Savonarola to Charles VIII, which is preserved in the San Marco library at Venice, has been published by Perrens (*Savonarole,* I, 487). The letters to the King of England and the King of Hungary are lost.

[39] One of them ran thus:

O popolo ingrato,
Tu ne vai preso alla grida,
E dietro a un guida
Pienno d'ipocrisia.

[40] Pastor, VI, p. 5, states that the Pope showed great moderation throughout this affair. Ranke (*Historisch-biographische Studien,* p. 246) pays the same tribute. Alexander VI was especially adroit. Foreseeing that the friar would be ruined by his own excesses, the Pope made no haste to employ severe measures, but patiently waited until the people became detached from Savonarola.

[41] Perrens, *Savonarole,* I, p. 325.

Francesco Puglia, to accept this challenge, which they regarded as a defiance. An ardent disciple of Savonarola, the Dominican Fra Domenico Buonvicini, at once declared that he was ready to undergo the trial. But it was Girolamo Savonarola they wanted to see submit himself to the judgment of God. His foes looked for his confusion, his devoted followers expected a miracle.

It would seem that Fra Girolamo hesitated a long time and at length yielded reluctantly.[42] These ordeals of fire, in use during the later Middle Ages, had been explicitly forbidden by the popes of the twelfth and thirteenth centuries;[43] but Savonarola's friends maintained that the gravity of the circumstances which, to their minds, involved the peace of the universal Church, justified an infraction of the ecclesiastical canons. Brother Girolamo accepted the ordeal. On April 7th, 1498,[44] in the Piazza della Signoria, a huge pile was constructed, through the middle of which a narrow passage was arranged. It was by this pasage that the two adversaries were to pass, after the pile was set aflame. A vast throng crowded to the spectacle. Did the two champions recoil before the danger? Did they entertain a secret hope that the Pope, notified of the intended violation of the laws of the Church, would intervene to prevent it? The delays, subterfuges, the endless disputes of the adversaries as to the conditions of this judgment of God, seemed to indicate a secret wish to evade the strange ordeal. All these incidents annoyed the crowd. A sudden shower momentarily interrupted the negotiations. A nervous agitation began to run through the multitude. Quarrels arose. Soon there was an indescribable tumult. Fra Francesco took refuge in the palace of the Signoria, Fra Girolamo in a church: finally, the ordeal was abandoned.

---

[42] During the trial Savonarola declared that he had in every way sought to foil Fra Domenico's project.

[43] Vacandard, *Études de critique d'histoire religieuse,* I, p. 213.

[44] Pico della Mirandola, *Vie de frère Jérôme Savonarole,* ch. 15, 65.

From this time onward, Savonarola's prestige seemed lost beyond recovery. Palm Sunday evening, when he and his most devoted friends were in the monastery of San Marco, the people attacked it and took it by assault. Savonarola, along with two of his companions, was arrested, turned over to the magistrates, and put to the torture. The Pope claimed the right to judge the accused. But the government of Florence went ahead with the case; they yielded only to the extent of admitting two papal judges to the court which would pronounce the sentence. When the two papal judges reached Florence, the trial was far advanced and the Florentine judges had made up their minds.[45] Savonarola, accused of having deceived the people by false prophecies, of having conspired against the government of Florence, and of having negotiated with the powers for the calling of a council against the Pope, was sentenced, as were also his two companions, "that each of the three be hung from the gibbet, and then burnt; so that their soul be entirely parted from their bodies." [46]

On the morning of their execution, they received communion in the chapel of the palace. Savonarola, taking the consecrated Host into his hands, asked pardon of God and of men for all the faults he had committed and for all the scandal he had given. They were then led to the Piazza. The instrument of execution erected there was a scaffold about six feet high, covered with combustible materials, from the midst of which there rose a gallows in the form of a cross. The Piazza was thronged with eager spectators, animated by very different feelings, some grief-stricken and downcast, others full of insolent joy.

The condemned men advanced to their execution courageously. Just when the flames were enclosing the body of Fra Girolamo, the words "Jesus! Jesus!" were heard. When a gust of wind divided the flames and thus enabled the friar's body to be seen, the people shouted: "A miracle, a miracle!" But it was only for a moment. The fire accomplished its work. This was May 23rd, 1498. Girolamo Savonarola had reached the age of 45 years and 8 months.[47]

---

[45] Pastor, VI, p. 48.

[46] Villari, II, p. 404

With great courage, lofty talent, undoubted good will, but with manifest exaggerations and an independence that went to the point of disobedience and revolt, Savonarola for a time personified the popular indignation against the abuses of the civil and religious governments of the Renaissance. There have been saints, like St. Philip Neri and St. Catherine de Ricci, who praised his virtues. Later on we shall discuss the import of his philosophical and mystical work. Cardinal Newman, without misconstruing the purity of the eloquent Dominican's intentions or the integrity of his morals, seems to have expressed the judgment of history when he wrote: "He thought too much of himself and rose against a power which no one can attack without injuring himself. No good can come of disobedience; that was not the way to become the apostle of either Florence or Rome." [48]

Caesar Borgia

Savonarola's disappearance marked the beginning of a new period of triumph for Caesar Borgia. He quit the purple (August 17th, 1498) and shortly afterwards, as Duke of Valentinois, married a French princess, Charlotte d'Albert, daughter of the King of Navarre. With the support of French and papal troops, he then gave free rein to his insatiable ambition. In the spring of 1499 he began a campaign against the chief Italian families. To take Urbino from the Montefeltri,

---

[47] On the trial and execution of Savonarola, see Leclercq, *Les martyrs*, VI, pp. 323-368.

[48] Quoted by Pastor, VI, p. 53. Savonarola may have been in good faith in attacking the legitimacy of Alexander's authority. See Pastor, VI, p. 218.

Perugia from the Boglioni, Siena from the Petrucci, stir up Arezzo, Cortona, and Pisa against Florence, return in triumph to Rome, and there receive the golden rose blessed by the Sovereign Pontiff and obtain the title of Gonfalonier of the Holy See, was a matter of scarcely three years.

The conqueror no longer hesitated at any crime. In 1498 his sister Lucretia had married Duke Alfonso of Biseglia. On August 18th, 1500, Caesar, provoked by Alfonso, entered his brother-in-law's bedroom and had him strangled before his very eyes by Don Michelotto. "Evidently Alexander VI thought it prudent to hush up the whole affair as much as possible; no doubt he too was afraid of Caesar." [49] By various Bulls the Pope conferred several duchies on members of his family, notably on a son of Lucretia and Alfonso, and on one of his own sons, Juan Borgia, whom he had just legitimated.[50] "Almost the entire State of the Church was by this time a possession of the Borgia." [51] The cardinals complained at the sight of the Pope's family delving into the most intimate secrets of the administration of the Church. As a matter of fact, Alexander VI, in July, 1501, when leaving Rome for a sojurn in the country, "had the effrontery to hand over the regency of the palace to Lucretia Borgia during his absence, with power to open his correspondence." [52] A certain ambassador wrote: "The Pope has only one desire: it is to make his children powerful." [53]

"It is noteworthy that in matters purely concerning the Church, Alexander never did anything that justly deserves blame." [54] In fact, "not only is the bullarium of this monster faultless," as Joseph de Maistre remarks, but we see this unworthy Pope making himself a defender of the purity of the faith. In 1492 he made serious efforts to recall the utraquists of Bohemia to the unity of the Church. In 1500 he tried to protect the faithful against the Vaudois, who had spread over Moravia.[55] Even the missions of Greenland were an object of his solicitude.

---

[49] Pastor, VI, p. 78.

[50] "These undoubtedly genuine documents nullify all attempts to rebut the accusations against the moral conduct of the Pope." Pastor, VI, p. 105.

[51] Gregorovius, *History of the City of Rome in the Middle Ages,* VII, p. 481.

[52] "Of course," says Pastor, "Lucretia was only regent in regard to secular affairs, but such a thing had never been done before and was a startling breach of decorum." (VI, p. 104.)

[53] Quoted in Lavisse and Rambaud, IV, p. 18.

Alexander VI and the New World

The work of the propagation of the faith owes to Alexander's intervention another favor of still greater consequence. In 1492, as Alexander VI was mounting the steps of the papal throne, Christopher Columbus discovered a new world. The consequences of this event were destined to be of incalculable importance for the future of the Church and of general civilization. "Columbus needed not only genius," says a philosophical historian, "he needed also a principle of faith to dominate him, as it did the greater part of the men of his time. Long-distance voyagers and great adventurers, before and after Columbus, were not stirred solely by a thirst for gold or fame; and the governments which helped or encouraged them were not merely impelled by ambitious projects: they all were more or less animated by a zeal for religious propaganda." [56]

In March, 1493, when the discoverer returned to Spain, great was the joy at the court of Ferdinand and Isabella, who had been the patrons of the expedition. At Rome the joy was still greater at the thought that new fields were going to be opened for the missioners of the Gospel. But what nations were to exercise temporal jurisdiction over the newly discovered lands or those yet to be discovered? At the request of Columbus and on the basis of his reports, Alexander VI, after several days of negotiation conducted by the Spanish Cardinal Bernardino Carvajal, promulgated three Constitutions of great importance (May 3rd and 4th, 1493). "By virtue of his office as Vicar of Christ, in order the more easily to lead the peoples of those countries and islands to the Catholic faith, the Pope gave and assigned to Spain all the islands and mainland, discovered or to be discovered, west of a line running from the North to the South Pole and passing one hundred leagues west of the Azores Islands." [57]

---

[54] Pastor, VI, p. 140.

[55] *Ibid.*, p. 156.

[56] Cournoy, *Considérations sur la marche des idées dans les temps modernes*, I, p. 129.

Few acts have given occasion to more unjust criticism of the exercise of papal power. It has even been asserted that Alexander VI authorized the Europeans to reduce the inhabitants of the newly discovered lands to slavery.[58] An impartial interpretation of the document shows that "in all these deeds the grant refers to the other European princes and not to the populations of the New World," [59] that the latter may be converted to the Catholic faith by voluntary adherence,[60] and that the fact of their conversion was in no wise to the prejudice of the rights of the infidel rulers.[61] "As regards the other Christian States, Alexander VI conferred, so to speak, on the Spanish sovereigns a right similar to our patents and copyrights. Moreover, at the time of Alexander VI, Christian peoples still acknowledged, at least in theory, that the pope had this right of arbitration so often exercised in the Middle Ages." [62] In other words, the sending of missioners and the armed intervention which this sort of protectorate might require, was reserved to the Spaniards and Portuguese.[63] "The peaceful settlement of a number of thorny boundary questions between Spain and Portugal was entirely due to papal decisions and should therefore justly be regarded as one of the glories of the papacy. Nothing but complete misunderstanding and blind party spirit could turn it into a ground of accusation against Rome." [64]

---

[57] A decision of Pope Callistus III, in 1479, gave Portugal the right to found colonies and carry on commerce in the regions of the East. (*Bullarium romanum,* V, pp. 361–364.)

[58] Henri Martin, *Histoire populaire de la France,* I, p. 252.

[59] Pastor, VI, p. 162.

[60] This restriction was already a matter of law and had no need of being formulated. (Cf. Raynaldi, 1497, no. 33.)

[61] This was the doctrine then taught by all theologians, following St. Thomas (*Summa theol.,* 1a 2ae, q. 10, art. 10).

Death of Alexander VI

On August 12th, 1503, the Pope was taken with an attack of fever and vomiting. Six days later, as the fever grew worse, the Pontiff made his confession and received communion. At six o'clock that evening, after an attack of suffocation, he drew his last breath.[65] "This Pope," says Gebhart, "had impulses of greatness of soul, but he never had the time or freedom to carry out a generous action." [66]

"From the Catholic point of view," says Pastor, "we cannot condemn Alexander VI too severely." At the sight of certain scandals, to use Bossuet's words, we cannot help being "filled with a salutary and holy awe, when we contemplate the dangerous and slippery temptations with which God tries His Church, and the judgments which He exercises on her." [67] And it must be acknowledged that in the pontificate of Alexander VI the doctrines of the Church "were maintained in all their purity. It seemed as though his reign were meant by Providence to demonstrate the truth that though men may hurt the Church they cannot harm her." [68]

---

[62] De la Servière in *Dict. apol. de la foi catholique,* I, col. 85.

[63] It is thus that Bellarmine explained Alexander VI's act. (*De Romano pontifice,* V, p. 2.)

[64] Pastor, VI, p. 161.

[65] The idea of poisoning, advanced by some historians, must be discarded. Nothing abnormal occurred between the attacks of periodic fever, which had the marks of swamp fever or malaria.

[66] Lavisse and Rambaud, IV, p. 16.

[67] Bossuet, *Variations,* pref., sec. 29. I, p. 17.

---

[68] Pastor, VI, p. 140.

CHAPTER IX

1503–1517

THE death of Alexander VI decided the collapse of Caesar Borgia's power. This unscrupulous politician had, however, taken his own precautions in view of the fatal event. Men used to say: "It is Caesar who will be the next pope." Intrigues in the Sacred College, intrigues with the rulers of Europe—he had neglected nothing. But at the very hour of Alexander's death, he himself was prostrated by sickness. Says Machiavelli: "He told me that he had thought of everything that might occur at the death of his father, and had provided a remedy for all, except that he had never anticipated that, when the death did happen, he himself would be about to die." [1] Sick and far from Rome, Caesar nevertheless maintained a real influence which he sought to consolidate by an alliance with King Louis XII of France (September 1st, 1498).

Pius III

This influence, however, was counterbalanced by that of Cardinal Giuliano della Rovere. The strength of the two parties, now of equal power, allowed the moderate members of the Sacred College to assure a victory to the candidacy of the upright and pious Cardinal Francesco Piccolomini, nephew of Pope Pius II, who, in memory of his uncle, took the name of Pius III (September 23rd, 1503).

For all men of good will, this was a joy without reserve. "A new light has risen above us," wrote Pietro Delfino, general of the Camaldolese, "our hearts rejoice, our eyes weep, because God has at last taken pity on His Christian people and has given us a supreme pastor, holy, innocent, spotless. To mourning has succeeded rejoicing; after the night and the storm, have come dawn and calm." [2] It would be hard to imagine a more striking contrast than that between the Pope who had passed away and the one whom Providence had just given the Church. To quote a contemporary, "he left no moment unoccupied; his time for study was before daybreak; he spent his mornings in prayer and his midday hours in giving audiences, to which the humblest had easy access. He was so temperate in the use of food and drink that he only allowed himself an evening meal every other day." [3] In the various duties that had been entrusted to him by his uncle, especially a diplomatic mission to Germany and the government of the march of Picenum, he was noted for the lofty integrity of his life. The new Pope declared: "I do not wish to be a pope of war, but a pope of peace." [4] And this was the motto of his short pontificate. Pius III was gentle towards everyone, even toward Caesar Borgia, who requested that he be allowed to return to Rome and was permitted to do so. "I wish the Duke no ill," said the Pontiff, "for the pope, more than others, has the duty of being merciful towards all; yet I confess that Caesar will end badly at God's judgment." [5]

---

[1] Machiavelli, *The Prince*, p. 61.

Pius III was just sixty-four years old at his accession; but painful attacks of gout had greatly aged him. As he was only a deacon, it was necessary for him to be ordained to the priesthood and to receive episcopal consecration before the solemnity of his coronation. These long ceremonies used up his strength. He had to sit down while celebrating his first mass, and was obliged to postpone the ceremony of taking possession of the Lateran. The audiences which he gave, the long consistory that he held on September 11th, his struggles with the two families of Orsini and Colonna, now leagued against Caesar Borgia, ended by undermining his health. In September, 1503, he called his cardinals together and explained his programme to them. It may be summed up in two points: (1) a complete reform of the Church, including pope, cardinals, and curia, and (2) the restoration of peace in Christendom. Only a few days passed when his physicians declared that his extreme weakness left no hope. On October 18th, Pius III quietly fell asleep, after receiving the last Sacraments with such devotion as to greatly move the bystanders. Despite incessant rain, all Rome filed before his mortal remains, piously kissing his feet as those of a saint. "The death of Pius III," wrote Sigismondo Tizio, "was a great loss to the Church, to the city of Rome, and to us all, but perhaps we deserved no less for our sins." [6]

---

[2] Raynaldi, 1503; *P. Delphini oratiunculae,* p. xi.

[3] Sigismondo dei Conti da Foligno, *op. cit.,* II, p. 291. Gregorovius is the only historian who has ventured to suspect the morals of Pius III. He is refuted by Pastor, VI, p. 199.

[4] Dispacci di A. Giustiniani, II, p. 208.

[5] *Ibid.,* p. 207.

Julius II

Immediately after the death of Pius III, the old rivalries reappeared. Giuliano della Rovere and Caesar Borgia, after holding each other in check, judged it more advantageous to work in concert. In one of the shortest conclaves in the history of the papacy, Cardinal Giuliano della Rovere was elected pope by an almost unanimous vote (November 1st, 1503); he took the name of Julius II.[7] Everywhere his fine qualities were extolled. Physically and morally he possessed the nature of a giant. He had a large head and sharp features of sculptural beauty. His eyes sparkled and flamed beneath prominent brows; his nose was large, his lips were closely drawn. There was something powerfully majestic and dominating in his appearance, prompting his contemporaries to give him the epithet "Pontefice Terribile," which he himself applied to Michelangelo. His moral temperament corresponded to his physical traits. "He had no moderation either in will or conception; whatever was in his mind must be carried through, even if he himself were to perish in the attempt." [8] With a mind always active and a body always in motion, he never had the patience to listen quietly to those who were talking to him, nor to hold back a reproach, a cry of indignation, or a word of abuse: "It will kill me," he used to say, "if I don't let it out." At least he was never accused of dissimulation, for he was incapable of it; but his frankness went so far as to become violence and brutality.

---

[6] Nuti, *Littera di Sigismondo Tizio,* quoted by Pastor, VI, p. 207.

[7] The simoniacal character of Julius II's election seems certain to Pastor, who adduces numerous and striking testimonies in support of his opinion. (VI, p. 209.)

With his impetuosity of character, Julius II took up the scheme of government which the mild-natured Pius III had conceived to assure the peace of Christian peoples and to reform the Church.

The peace of Christian peoples did not seem to him possible save by the consolidation and extension of the temporal power of the Church. Being under obligations to Caesar Borgia for his election, Julius II was aware of the special difficulty of his situation in the face of him who had possession of the principal domains of the Church. But he soon had occasion to intervene in the affairs of the Duke of Valentinois. He seized it with his usual ardor.

The Venetians had profited by the ephemeral pontificate of Pius III, by the brief vacancy of the Holy See, and by Caesar's illness, to introduce themselves, by leave or by force, into the principal cities of the papal States. The power of Venice was becoming dangerous. Julius II, fearful of seeing all the strongholds of the Romagna, held by Caesar, fall into the hands of Venice, called upon him to turn over to the Holy See those which still remained in his power. Caesar refused; the Pope had him arrested and (January 29th, 1504) obtained from him as the price of his freedom, the surrender of the places in question.[9] Caesar was again arrested in Spain at the instigation of the Pope on May 27th; there was a second cession of the strongholds,[10] which curbed the ambition of the audacious Borgia for a couple of years. Caesar escaped from prison (October 25th, 1506) and gave the Pope a momentary scare; but he fell mortally wounded (May 12th, 1507) before the walls of Viana in Navarre, and the Pope, by receiving his inheritance, profited by his conquests. "Although his intention was not to aggrandize the Church but the Duke, nevertheless what he did contributed to the greatness of the Church, which after his death and the ruin of the Duke, became heir to all his labors." [11]

---

[8] Quoted by Pastor, VI, pp. 214.

A patiently reorganized financial administration, strict economy,[12] complete freedom from nepotism in appointments to public office,[13] nine years of negotiation, effort, and strife to repress the factions at Rome and in the provinces, finally ended in restoring papal authority in Italy. Certain favorable circumstances, events that seemed providential, certain movements that Julius was able to turn to profit, gave him a chance to make his authority prevail among the nations of Europe. But the intervention of France in the affairs of Italy disturbed him. He swore to chase the French from Italian soil and, in 1510, considered that he was strong enough to begin the inevitable struggle with Louis XII. "These Frenchmen," he said

[9] Burchard, *Diarium,* III, p. 331.

[10] Pastor, VI, p. 243.

[11] Machiavelli, p. 93.

[12] Pastor, VI, p. 223.

[13] "Other popes had labored to procure principalities for their sons or their nephews: it was the ambition of Julius to extend the dominions of the Church." (Ranke, *History of the Popes,* I, p. 40.)

to the Venetian ambassador (June 19th, 1510), "want to make me their king's chaplain; I intend to be pope in spite of them, and I will show them by my acts." On January 20th, 1511, despite his seventy years, Pope Julius II joined his army before the walls of Mirandola, and when the stronghold capitulated, in his haste to enter the conquered city, did so through the breach by means of a ladder.

The Protestant historian Ranke says: "If we inquire what enabled him to assume so commanding an attitude, we find it principally attributable to the fact that the state of public opinion in his day permitted the frank avowal of his natural tendencies; he was free to profess them openly; nay, to make them his boast. The reëstablishment of the States of the Church was in that day considered not only a glorious, but even a religious enterprise; every effort of the Pope was directed towards this end; by this one idea were all his thoughts animated." [14] A more recent historian says: "There is no doubt but this Pope, by his political programme, his alliances, and his wars, extended both the power and the prestige of the papacy. With him the modern Church begins. . . . Through him the Eternal City became the center of the political world." [15]

He made it equally the center of the artistic movement. "It is to the patron of Bramante, Michelangelo, and Raphael, to the Pope who, even as a cardinal, was such a generous friend of artists, that Rome owes the proud position that she now holds of being the ideal center of esthetic beauty for all its devotees throughout the whole world . . . Bramante's St. Peter's, Michelangelo's ceiling in the Sistine Chapel, Raphael's frescoes in the Stanze . . . are the undying memorials of the aim and purport of the reign of Julius II." [16]

---

[14] *Ibid.*, I, p. 41.

[15] Imbart de la Tour, II, p. 56. "The temporal power of the Church, which before the time of Alexander was looked on with contempt by all the Protestants of Italy, and not only by those so styling themselves, but by every baron and lordling however insignificant, has now reached such a pitch of greatness that the king of France trembles before it." (Machiavelli, *The Prince*, ed. 1897, p. 79.)

There remained for the great Pope only to make Rome the center of the religious movement, properly so called. By summoning a general council to meet at Rome, Julius II realized this third project, the while he was preparing the reform of the Church. There was no reason for delusive hopes. Neither political hegemony in Europe nor the supreme prestige exercised over men's minds by the splendor of arts could be lasting without the union of souls in a common faith and in a filial obedience to the Vicar of Christ.

Real Power of the Papacy

Let us examine what was the real power of the papacy under the brilliant appearances of this period. Julius II was, in a sense, more powerful than Gregory VII or Innocent III, and he was aware of the fact. He proclaimed himself arbiter of the destinies of nations and wanted "to be lord and master of the game of the world." [17] In his reign they spoke of the "two swords, one of which was used by the Church, the other for the Church." [18] Kings took oaths of obedience to him.[19] He presented crowns and also purposed taking them away.[20] However, in all this we must recognize only a deceptive appearance and the rule of Christendom seemed indeed at an end. The failure of every attempt at a crusade, from Pius II to Leo X, at the very time when the Turkish danger was more threatening than ever, is a clear proof of it. Gallicanism also made its appearance; already it showed itself under two aspects: the limitation of papal prerogatives and the exaltation of royal power. On the other hand, the pope is seen to be in less immediate contact with the people than during the Middle Ages. Between him and the faithful, between him and his clergy, are found the kings with their national councils, most often under control of their commissioners. It is with the civil rulers that the Church has henceforth to treat. Concordats become the connecting link between the papacy and the national churches, which will at the same time derive therefrom a freedom which they did not possess before.

---

[16] Pastor, VI, p. 455f.

[17] *"Il papa vol esser il dominus et maistro del jocho del mundo."* (*Sommario de la relation di Domenigo Trivixan,* MS. quoted by Ranke, I, p. 40.

[18] Sigismondo dei Conti, II, app. no. 18.

[19] Instructions of King Louis XII, Bibl. Nat. Fr., 2930. Quoted by Imbart de la Tour, II, p. 59.

[20] In 1510 the Pope offered the French crown to the King of England and prepared the Bull of Louis XII's deposition. (Imbart de la Tour, II, p. 134.)

The papal power, too, however universal it may appear, was no longer international in the same sense as formerly. The papacy under Julius II is, in a way, an Italian papacy. This "Italianization" of the papacy was a necessity. "To escape the tutelage and hostility of the great powers, it was necessary that the pope should be a stranger to all. A French, German, English, or Spanish pope would always be under suspicion of serving the interests of his country. An Italian pope, thanks to the divisions and political effacement of the peninsula, could no longer give rise to umbrage. Rome became nationalized so as to maintain, between the cupidities of European states, the internationalism of religion." [21]

But this new organization was not without its serious disadvantages for the internal life of the Church. Such a political centralization allowed a development of the Roman Curia, which became a court and soon had all the disadvantages of one. The "Sacred Palace" was peopled by 600 or 800 "curiales," or officials of all sorts, from masters of ceremonies and chamberlains to policemen, janissaries, and other kinds of armed men. Under Julius II and Leo X comedies and ballets had to be given to entertain this crowd.

The concentration of masterpieces of painting and sculpture at Rome was not without danger. It was no longer a question of those innocent works in which the artist, while combining the finest effects of line and light, was aware that he was performing a religious act and sought to arouse the spirit of prayer; in the purest masterpieces of Raphael and Michelangelo we can perceive the tendency which was to lead their disciples to sacrifice everything to the magic of color and the grace of form: it meant the end of Christian art.

---

[21] *Ibid.*, p. 55.

The calling of a general council was becoming more and more urgent. The Emperor of Germany and the King of France, disturbed at the growing power of Julius II, openly sought to limit the spiritual authority of the papacy and spoke of convoking conciliar assemblies on their own initiative. In the autumn of 1510, Emperor Maximilian, on the pretext of caring for the interests of the Church, but in reality to exert political pressure on the Pope and force him to enter the league of Cambrai, threatened the Holy See with the promulgation of a Pragmatic Sanction and the suppression of the annates in Germany. He also demanded that a legate be permanently established in Germany, whose duty it would be to pass judgment on all religious questions that might arise there. "This plan, in combination with the introduction of a Pragmatic Sanction, was the first step towards a severance of the German Church from Rome, in other words, towards a schism." [22] At the same time Louis XII gathered an assembly at Tours, composed of 5 archbishops, 55 bishops, 50 doctors of theology, and representatives of the universities and parliaments, and obtained from them a declaration that the king of France could, with a safe conscience and without departing from the unity of the Church, call for the assembling of a general council, as authorized by the Council of Basle, and if needs be, declare war on the Holy See.[23]

---

[22] Pastor, VI, p. 356.

[23] On the Council of Tours, see Imbart de la Tour, II, pp. 131–137.

On May 16th, 1511, the ambassadors of Maximilian and Louis XII had it decided by three cardinals that a council would be assembled at Pisa in spite of the Pope. The irritated King of France spoke of deposing Julius II, whereas the Emperor contented himself with carrying on negotiations with him through his legate, Matthew Lang, bishop of Gurk.[24]

Caricatures as well as pamphlets ridiculing the Church and the Pope in prose and verse, were circulated with the approbation of the sovereigns. King Louis XII, "who used the theatre as modern politicians use the press," [25] gave full license to jibe at the papacy.

The Pope's illness made him suffer tortures, while his military expeditions rendered more frequent the attacks of gout from which he suffered habitually. But the valiant Pontiff was never so great as in the midst of affliction, his strength of will making everything yield, even the most atrocious pains. He condemned the rebellious cardinals who had lent their support to the schismatic undertakings of the Emperor and the King of France. While these latter, disconcerted by the Pope's straight blow, were hesitating what to do, the Pope, steadily pursuing his aim, convoked a council at Rome, made an alliance with King Ferdinand the Catholic of Spain, and formed a league against France. Spain and Venice were at first the only members of the league, but the adherence of England and Germany was in reserve (October 5th, 1511).[26]

The Lateran Council

The Bull convoking this Council, dated July 25th, 1511, began by recalling that the Pope alone has the right to summon such an assembly and that a council meeting without his participation would be radically null. Then, in exact terms, the Pontiff assigned a fourfold object for the deliberations of the Council: to stifle the nascent schisms in their germ, to repress the heresies still alive, to reform the morals of clergy and laity, to gather Christian peoples into a single group that they might be able to undertake a holy war against the Turks. The new assembly would be held in Rome itself, at the Lateran palace, after the Easter festivities of the next year, April 19th, 1512.

---

[24] Hergenröther, IV, p. 672.

[25] Lanson, *Hist. de la lit. franc.*, 7th ed., p. 211. On the pamphlets and caricatures of this period, see Maulde de la Clavière, *Les origines de la révolution française au commencement du XVI^e siècle*, p. 272; Fleury, *Histoire de la caricature sous la réforme et la ligue*, p. 3.

[26] Raynaldi, 1511; Imbart de la Tour, II, p. 157.

A grievous illness seemed, for a moment, to destroy all the Pope's projects by reawakening the hopes of his foes. In a letter dated September 18th, 1511, Maximilian I even went so far as to express the chimerical dream of placing on his own head both the imperial crown and the papal tiara.[27] But the face of affairs was changed by the unexpected recovery of the intrepid Pontiff. Maximilian, that "affable Caesar, smitten with greatness, but without will-power, money or soldiers, spending his life in undertakings that never succeeded,"[28] was not of a stature to make Julius II tremble. After certain differences of opinion with Louis XII as to the city where the Council should be held, and some disputes between imperial and French troops, the Emperor withdrew from any agreement with the King of France, and the latter was left alone to bear the responsibility for the schismatical council.

It opened at Pisa (September 30th, 1511), under the presidency of Cardinal Carvajal. Even the arrival of five dissentient cardinals (Briconnet, de Prie, Albret, Borgia, and Sanseverino) proved powerless to save its prestige. It was necessary to come to some determination. The conciliar theory had had its day. The former assemblies of Pisa and Basle had so lowered it in public esteem that churches and inns closed their doors to the fathers of the pretended council and their retinues. They were obliged painfully to shift from Pisa to Milan, from Milan to Asti, from Asti to Lyons. Everywhere the reception was about the same. A raising of taxes on ecclesiastics, decreed by the Council for the benefit of the French king, stirred up opposition in all directions. The abbot of Cluny declared that to the Pope alone and his legate belonged the right to tax him. The clergy of Aix, Digne, and Riez followed the example of Cluny and were imitated by a great number of churches.

---

[27] The text of this letter, preserved in the archives of Lille, was published by Le Glay, *Correspondance de Maximilien Ier et de Marguerite d'Autriche,* II, p. 37.

[28] Imbart de la Tour, II, p. 142.

The entrance of a great theologian into the lists gave the opposition a nobler impulse. The Dominican Tommaso de Vio Gaetani, better known as Cajetan, who later on took a most important part in the defense of the Church against the errors of Luther, was renowned for his brilliant dispute with Pico della Mirandola in 1494. This small dark-complexioned man, whom Duke Sforza of Milan took delight in ridiculing because of his awkward appearance, had already given proofs of immense learning in philosophy, theology, and exegesis, in the courses taught at the University of Pavia and at the Sapienza in Rome. He became general of his Order in 1508. He took part in the theological discussions over the question of the Council of Pisa by the publication of his treatise *De auctoritate papae et concilii,* wherein he maintained that a council does not receive its authority directly from Christ; that, if the pope is not a party to it, it does not represent the universal Church; that there is a very great difference between the authority of a council in case of a doubtful pope and that authority in case of an incontestable pope, such as Julius II.

Some parliamentarians and court prelates, such as a judge, Nicole Bertrand, a lawyer, Vincent Sigault, and Abbé Zaccaria Ferreri, attempted a defense of the false council. James Almain, a young doctor of the Sorbonne, tried to refute

Cajetan's thesis. But the people were not on the side of these false doctors. Pierre Gringoire himself, who had been encouraged by the King to make a laughing-stock of the Pope for the multitude, now ended his plays by an appeal for peace.[29] Public opinion also found expression in two poems that appeared in 1512, the *Conseil de paix,* in which the author called upon princes to make peace with the Pope and France and to prepare for the reformation "by a good council," and *La déploration de l'Eglise militante,* in which the poet Jean Bouchet expressed the same wish for "reform through peace."

The Council of Pisa finished its agony at Lyons, leaving the Pope's power stronger than before.

The Lateran Council, which was the eighteenth ecumenical council, opened on May 3rd, 1512, with the adherence of Spain and England. That of Germany came on November 4th. The council was called "to put an end to schism, to restore general peace, and to assure reform." All pure and upright souls in the Church were thrilled with joy. The illustrious and devout Giles of Viterbo, general of the Augustinians, voiced this universal rejoicing in the opening address: "Our eyes have seen the holy and salutary beginning of a long awaited restoration. The spouse was prostrate on the earth, like dead foliage in winter; but now behold her rise and blossom again with the vivifying breath of the councils . . . And what I say of faith, I can say of temperance, wisdom, justice, and all the virtues. Holy Father, after so many victories which you have gained, there remained but two things that you lacked: to call a council and to give peace to the Christian people. Know, Holy Father, that you have raised the hearts of all toward a great hope." [30]

It was at the very dawn of this hope that the intrepid Pontiff died. From Pentecost, 1512, his health had rapidly declined. "They flatter me," he said, "but I feel that my strength grows less hour by hour and I know that I have not much longer to live." The strongest stimulants and other remedies were used in vain by the physicians to give him sleep and appetite. Up to his very last days he continued, despite the advice of those about him, to work without relaxation and to receive cardinals and ambassadors even when confined to bed. On the night of February 21st, 1513, after piously receiving the last sacraments, he yielded his great soul to God. An immense throng was present at his funeral. "Rome," says the Protestant historian Gregorovius, "felt that a royal soul had quitted this world." [31]

---

[29] *Le jeu du prince des sots et de la Mère Sotte,* a farce played at the Halles in Paris, February 28th, 1512, closes with an appeal for peace.

[30] Mansi, XXXII, p. 669.

Leo X

On March 11th the Sacred College unanimously chose as successor to the robust old man who had so vigorously governed the Church for almost ten years a young cardinal who had not yet attained his thirty-eighth year. He was the second son of Lorenzo the Magnificent, Giovanni de' Medici, and took the name of Leo X.

We know the brilliant circle of humanists in which the young Florentine patrician grew up and the prudent advice which he received from his father when, scarcely fourteen years old, he had been raised to the dignity of a member of the Sacred College.[32] "He had a broad forehead, firm chin, lofty and serene features, but his eyes twinkled and his white hand reclined listlessly." [33] He gave no promise of being a man of commanding deeds and strong passions like his predecessor.

---

[31] Gregorovius, *Geschichte der Stadt Rom im Mittelalter,* VIII, p. 108.

[32] Innocent VIII raised him to the cardinalate in 1488. However, before receiving the insignia of his new rank, he was obliged to study theology for three years. On March 9th, 1492, he was received into the College of Cardinals.

[33] Imbart de la Tour, II, 452.

Polished, literary, easy and gracious in his manner, he showed himself inclined to gorgeous display among the great, mild and generous toward the poor, pliant and conciliatory towards all; nowhere in Europe was free-thought more unrestrained than at his court. If Rome and the world acclaimed his advent with almost unanimous enthusiasm, it was perhaps because there was no one in the world who was more "a man of the times" than he was. Therein lay both his strength and his weakness.

To continue and conclude the Lateran Council and negotiate a concordat with France were the first great works of his pontificate.

Leo X had been pope only a month when he took up on his own account the programme which Julius II had outlined for the council.[34] He appointed three commissions in the council: the first was charged with the study of the various questions relating to peace between nations; the second was to devise means for abolishing the Pragmatic Sanction; the third had for its mission to prepare a scheme of general reform. In the month of December, after diplomatic preliminaries, Louis XII's complete adherence to the Lateran Council was obtained.[35]

The task of the first commission was too complex to lead to any immediate results: Leo X's mild spirit and acute diplomacy accomplished more for peace than all the conciliar measures. The abolition of the Pragmatic Sanction, the aim of the second commission, became effective only by the conclusion of a concordat. As for the general reform of morals, it constituted the object of a plan presented to the Council at its ninth session (May 5th, 1514).[36] The first section of the plan had the pope directly in mind: it treated of the manner of appointing and transferring bishops and the various abuses created by the introduction of commendatory benefices, cumulation of benefices and trafficking in them. Then followed a requirement that the cardinals conduct themselves as becomes priests, visit their churches, live in the place of their legation or reside in curia. The regulations proposed for the religious education of children, the suppression of the wide-spread practices of sorcery, and the protection of ecclesiastical property against the encroachments of civil rulers, all breathed the same sincere desire to undertake a serious reform of morals. But these last provisions, as also those concerning the curia and the Sacred College, were left too vague. In vain will you look there for a practical, concrete, and energetic reform of the abuses which so gravely compromised the episcopacy, the secular clergy, and the mass of the faithful.

---

[34] Mansi, XXXII, pp. 782–784.

[35] *Ibid.*, p. 832.

[36] *Ibid.*, p. 874.

The axe was not applied with a bold hand except to the regulars, especially the mendicants. These had at times abused the system of exemptions and the celebrated Bull *"Mare magnum"* of Sixtus IV which gave them very extensive powers. At the second session the Pope complained of "the unbounded audacity of the *exempt.*" [37] At the eleventh session some of the prelates called for the suppression of that famous Bull. Finally a decree was passed reëstablishing the bishops' authority over mendicant religious.[38] Provisions relating to preaching, clerical studies, and the heretical tendencies of the philosophers of the day completed the reform work of the Council.

This work, however, left but few traces. As it was decreed by bishops who were too sparing of themselves, it failed almost completely. Nearly everywhere the monks opposed it by the force of inertia, sometimes by open resistance.[39] The legists of the royal courts, hostile to the dominance of Rome, placed their inexhaustible resources of tactics at the service of the refractory monks,[40] and popular sentiment took the side of the religious.

---

[37] *Ibid.*, p. 908.

[38] *Ibid.*, p. 970.

[39] Imbart de la Tour, II, pp. 531–535.

Pierre Gringoire used the stage to abuse the pretended reformers, "papelards, bigots, hypocrites," who declaimed against all vices, but ran after money, who expelled the poor friars, but spared the powerful abbeys.[41] The poet's biting raillery was not without some foundation. Most of the bishops had not abandoned their habits of frivolity and luxury; such a manner of life persisted in the Roman Curia more than anywhere else. The restoration of Christian and religious life was carried out only by a few sincerely virtuous bishops and abbots.[42] The venerable Giles of Viterbo, in his inaugural address, had proclaimed, with the magisterial weight of his virtue and learning: "It is possible to restore human institutions by holiness, but not to restore holiness by human institutions." [43]

The Concordat with France

The concordat of 1516, which regulated the external relations of the Church with France, was effective only inasmuch as it consecrated established conditions and offered orientations that were made possible by the development of customs.

If the medieval theory of the pope's direct dominance in the national churches was abandoned, the new theories of a parliamentary church governed by councils or of a group of autonomous churches under the direction of temporal princes, were equally discredited. The idea of a compromise between these diverse doctrines came from the conciliatory spirit of Leo X and Francis I, and especially from the political genius of a great lawyer, Duprat.

---

[40] *Ibid.*, p. 535.

[41] Gringoire, *Les folles entreprises*, I, p. 101.

[42] For example, in the Order of Cluny, a chapter, held in 1504, stated that several monasteries had been brought back to a better manner of life. (Lorain, *Essai historique sur l'abbaye de Cluny*, ch. 21.) Other examples could be found among the Carthusians, to whom even Erasmus renders high praise (*Colloquies: The Soldier and Carthusian*), at Fontevrault and Citeaux and among their dependencies. (Imbart de la Tour, II, pp. 523–526.)

[43] *"Homines per sacra immutari fas est, non sacra per homines."* (Mansi, XXXII, p. 669.)

The successor of Julius II and the successor of Louis XII seemed made to understand each other. Francis I united in his person the best qualities and the worst defects of the Frenchman of the sixteenth century; Leo X was the perfect type of an Italian humanist. But at that period the two nations were united in their devotion to art, literature, and distinction of manners. When the son of Lorenzo the Magnificent made his first appearance at the court of France, the courtiers, without any ill intent, called him "the polished lieutenant of the King of Heaven"; and it is related that when King Louis XII looked upon his young cousin so full of life and animation, so generous and chivalrous, he could not help saying: "Oh, what a fine gentleman!" It is true that at the same time he shook his head and added: "We are laboring in vain; this boy will waste it all."

At the outset Francis I seemed, on the contrary, to save everything. His brilliant campaign in Italy, undertaken to conquer the Milan country, and his victory at Marignano (September 15th, 1515) semed to inaugurate a glorious reign. The Pope, who had clung to the league entered into between the Emperor and the King of Spain to defend the Duke of Milan, was overwhelmed. "What is going to become of us?" he cried, upon learning from the Venetian ambassador of the defeat of the allies. "Holy Father," replied the ambassador, "your Holiness will suffer no harm. Is not the most Christian King the eldest son of the Church?" It was then that Leo X wondered whether it might be possible to recover by diplomacy the advantages which he had lost through the victory of the

French King. An understanding with France seemed to him, too, quite opportune in view of the unbounded ambitions which were coming to light on the side of Spain. Leo X then proposed a conference to Francis I.

The Pragmatic Sanction had been the occasion of endless conflicts for Louis XI, Charles VIII, and Louis XII; the method of appointment to benefices, as provided by the royal act, was no less harmful to the sovereign authority of the King than to that of the Pope. The activities of the Holy See against the partisans of the Pragmatic Sanction had made trouble in the kingdom. Would it not be better to replace this unilateral act, perennially in dispute, by a concordat freely agreed to by the King of France and the head of the Church? On the side of Francis I there was a man who, at need, would keep him in mind of the crown's interests. He was "that ill-mannered Auvergnian, determined, trained, well-informed, imperious, whom history celebrates and often curses under the name of Chancellor Duprat"; [44] "one of the most important men of old France," according to the judgment of a good critic, "and perhaps, if we except Richelieu, the minister who has exercised the greatest influence on the destinies of France." [45] It was to him that Francis I entrusted the negotiations.

The interview between the Pope and the King took place at Bologna and was magnificent. The young King was escorted by 1200 men of arms and 6000 lansquenets; the Pope was surrounded by thirty cardinals.[46]

Three questions were to be solved, concerning benefices, jurisdiction, and finances.

We are already acquainted with the system of benefices: some were elective, that is, conferred by the free choice of the chapters; the others were collative, that is, conferred by the bishop or the patron. As for the former, a solution was already prepared by successive compromises which would result in a system of appointment by the king and canonical institution by Rome. This solution constituted the fourth, fifth, and sixth articles of the concordat.[47] The king, however, could appoint only candidates meeting the canonical requirements, and the pope would refuse institution only in the case of men notoriously unfit or unworthy.

---

[44] Baudrillart, *Quatre cents ans de Concordat,* p. 68.

[45] Hanotaux, *Recueil des instructions,* I, p. lvi.

[46] Madelin, *De conventu bononiensi,* pp. 52–58, 66.

The régime of collative benefices had for a long time been troubled by the introduction of "expectative graces" and "expectative mandates," by which a collator or patron, even the pope himself, promised a person to confer a benefice on him in case of vacancy. The eighth article suppressed expectative graces and reservations of every sort.[48] The concordat also accorded an important place to university graduates and reserved a third of the benefices to them (eleventh article).[49]

The solution of the question of jurisdiction was, like that of the benefices, prepared by precedents of procedure. The concordat provided that "outside of major cases, expressly specified as such in the canons, all cases would be brought before the judges of the parties, who by right, custom, or privilege have jurisdiction over them." [50] The Holy See remained the supreme court of appeal, but only after all intermediate jurisdictions had been exhausted.

The financial question, treated evasively, and probably by mutual agreement, in the concordat of Bologna,[51] was regulated by a Bull of October 1st, 1516.[52] The Pope fixed the manner of paying the annates. This was the most delicate question to be settled. The King of France, or rather Chancellor Duprat, allowed the Pope to triumph in the matter of right, but in fact, as evidenced by the recent study of the reports of the chamber, this tax, which had become so unpopular, was henceforth paid only by a small number of benefices and for a trifling portion of their annual revenue.[53]

---

[47] Mansi, XXXII, pp. 1020–1022.

[48] *Ibid.*, p. 1022.

[49] *Ibid.*, p. 1023.

[50] Tit. XXIII; *ibid.*, p. 1028.

[51] Mansi, p. 1039.

[52] *Ibid.*, p. 1042.

The concordat touched on the question of reform in a few articles: a prohibition against seculars holding benefices of regulars, and vice versa; strong measures against clerics living in concubinage;[54] the establishment of a pulpit in each church, where the Sacred Scriptures should be taught at least once a week.[55]

Public opinion for the most part received the concordat of 1516 with favor; but Parliament found fault with it for surrendering the royal jurisdiction over ecclesiastical cases by the right of appeal to the Holy See and by the trial of "major cases" at Rome; the University could not forgive the two contracting sovereigns for the abolition of the Pragmatic Sanction and thereby abandoning the theory of conciliary supremacy; some of the clergy regretted the loss of the right of election. From these the concordat met with a violent opposition which prevented its registration for more than a year.[56] This memorable agreement, which was destined to regulate the situation of the Church in France for almost three centuries, until 1790, was, taken all in all, a benefit to the Church. By modifying the régime of elective benefices, it prevented the formation of a wealthy and powerful ecclesiastical aristocracy which might have been able, at the appearance of Luther and Calvin, to play in France the same part as the ecclesiastical aristocracy in Germany, to arouse the same cupidity of princes and lay nobility, and thus furnish the Protestant movement additional strength. By officially obliging the king of France to accept the regular intervention of the pope in the religious organism of the nation, it restored the spiritual authority of the papacy. To pretend that the Holy See was "paid in smoke" for its big concessions, is an exaggeration; the destruction of the first two articles of the Pragmatic Sanction, proclaiming the superiority of councils over the pope, was surely a result of the highest importance. To maintain, as some have done, that Leo X, by granting to the king a right of appointment to benefices, "gave away what did not belong to him," is no less clearly unjust; for the pope did not confer on the king any right of ownership to the benefices, and the right of partial jurisdiction which he did concede belonged to the papacy by virtue of the most authentic traditions.[57]

---

[53] Richard in *Revue d'Histoire Ecclésiastique,* VIII (1907), p. 144.

[54] Mansi, p. 1030.

[55] *Ibid.,* p. 1023.

[56] For an account of this opposition, see Baudrillart, *Quatre cents ans de Concordat,* p. 90; Imbart de la Tour, II, p. 469.

The agreement concluded between Leo X and the King of France did not, it is true, lay all dangers at rest. After the concordat the legists did not abandon their subversive doctrines, nor the nobles their ambitious cupidity and dissolute life, nor the exalted souls of this period their plans of spiritual renovation. A breath of revolution was blowing over Europe. A Saxon monk was soon to seize upon all these scattered forces and let loose upon the Church the most violent tempest that she had ever encountered.

---

[57] Cf. Jules Thomas, *Le concordat de 1516.*

CHAPTER X

The Intellectual Evolution of the Renaissance

The political and social movements which aroused legists, churchmen, popular preachers, and chimerical dreamers against the institutions of the Middle Ages, had as an accomplice a more hidden, but not less powerful movement of artistic, philosophical, and religious thought. The leaders of this intellectual evolution represented it as a return to antiquity and to nature. It took the name of Renaissance and developed especially in Italy, Germany, France, and England.

Petrarch

The Italian Renaissance was born on the banks of the Rhone, at Avignon, during the sojourn of the popes in that city.[1] But there art, properly so called, still held to the Middle Ages. The massive feudal construction of the papal castle and the original gigantic shrine which formed the tomb of John XXII are monuments of Gothic architecture; but the sumptuous villas erected on the banks of the Rhone by the cardinals of the papal court already indicate a change from the feudal manors, and the painter Simone Memmi, who came to Avignon in 1339 to decorate the papal palace and the church of Notre Dame des Doms with his frescoes, is, in carefulness of line and color, a real precursor of the new times.[2]

---

[1] Guiraud, *L'Eglise romaine et les origines de la Renaissance,* p. 59.

[2] *Ibid.,* p. 41. Cf. Faucon, *Les artistes à la cour d'Avignon.* It is supposed that Raphael and Michelangelo drew inspiration from Memmi, the former in his "Transfiguration," the latter in his "Last Judgment."

Avignon was the cradle particularly of the literary Renaissance. Clement V moved the papal library there and John XXII enriched it with the works of Seneca, Pliny, and Ptolemy,[3] and enabled literature and science to profit by the relations between the Holy See and the East.[4] Urban V surrounded himself with the most celebrated humanists, such as Salutati and Francesco Bruni, and admitted them to the "College of Apostolic Secretaries." Thus did the popes of Avignon prepare or second the great intellectual movement of the fourteenth century. But its chief glory belongs to an Italian.

Francesco Petrarch, the "first of the moderns," as he has been called, was born at Arezzo on the border line of Tuscany and Umbria, July 20th, 1304. While still young, he left Italy soon after his father, who was exiled as a Ghibelline at the same time as Dante. Thereafter most of his life was passed at Avignon and its environs. In spite of his father's wish that he take up an administrative or judicial career, young Petrarch passionately devoted himself to poetry, the cultivation of ancient letters, and the researches of erudition. After a sojourn in the secluded valley of Vaucluse, which he immortalized by his verses, and some diplomatic missions, which brought him into contact with the principal scholars and artists of his time, he died at his country home at Arqua, in Italy, July 18th, 1374, at the age of seventy.

It is a mistake to think of Francesco Petrarch only as the delightful author of the *Canzoniere,* the subtle and melancholy verses which "are the source of modern lyric poetry." [5] Petrarch was also "an enlightened bibliophile, who did everything possible to promote research and to make the correction of texts a fashionable study." [6] From him as initiator are descended "the Italian humanists of the fifteenth century, those incomparable collectors whose genius for conjectural emendation has never been surpassed." [7]

---

[3] *Ibid.,* p. 52.

[4] *Ibid.,* pp. 55, 58.

[5] Brunetière, *Histoire de la littérature française,* I, p. 11.

[6] Langlois, *Manuel de bibliographie historique,* p. 247.

This favorite of popes is the type of nascent humanism in the period when it was still Christian. He had the two dominant passions of the Renaissance man, as humanism later formed him: a devotion to physical beauty and a passion for glory. The mere sight of a perfect figure in the porch of St. Clare's church at Avignon, was enough to trouble the poet's life. As to his thirst for glory, it was scarcely gratified by the superb triumph in the spring of 1341, when he mounted the steps of the Capitol amid the acclamations of an immense throng, to receive the crown of poetry.

Petrarch, despite some lamentable weaknesses of his private life, ever remained a Christian in heart and mind. In his celebrated dialogue *De contemptu mundi,* which he called his *Secretum,* he examines his conscience and bitterly accuses himself of denying the faith by his persistent temptations to sensualism and the pagan spirit. When reading Cicero, he cannot refrain from marginal notes whenever the great orator offends his beliefs: *"Cave!"* he writes, *"male dicis."* [8] "Practices of an almost scrupulous piety are habitual with him . . . Every night he rises to pray to God . . . Every Friday the chanter of Laura de Sade imposes a rigorous fast on himself; and he has a special devotion to the Blessed Virgin." [9] Henry Cochin says: "We might write a book entitled *Petrarch and Mysticism,* which would be the companion volume of Nolhac's *Petrarch and Humanism.*" [10]

After his great triumph at Rome, he recalls his austere abode at Avignon, and celebrates "the triumph of chastity" as greater than the triumph of science and art.[11]

---

[7] *Ibid.*

[8] Guiraud, pp. 68–71.—Cf. Pierre de Nolhac, *Pétrarque et l'humanisme.*

[9] Mézières, *Pétrarque. Étude d'après de nouveaux documents.*

[10] Henri Cochin, *Le frère de Pétrarque,* in the *Revue d'Histoire et de Litt. Rel.,* 1901, p. 43.

The popes showered the tokens of their benevolence on this great man and encouraged him in every way. Petrarch was a cleric; he never became a priest and perhaps did not even receive minor orders; but his clerical status enabled him to hold benefices. In 1335 Benedict XII made him canon of Lombez; eight years later Clement VI appointed him ambassador to Naples, soon after made him protonotary apostolic, and finally, in 1348, archdeacon of Parma. By bestowing so many favors on him, especially by giving him access to the treasures of their library and accrediting him as legate in foreign countries, the popes of Avignon aided the spread of the new culture and should, therefore, be considered the first patrons of the literary Renaissance inspired by the Christian spirit.[12]

After the Western Schism

During the sad period of the Western Schism (1377 to 1417) the artistic and literary movement was retarded, nay, almost halted; but the pontificates of Martin V, Eugene IV, and Nicholas V gave it a new impulse. Questions of general policy did not completely absorb Martin V's activity. At his summons, the painters Victor Pisanello and Gentile da Fabriano came to Rome to continue the work of artistic renovation begun by the school of Giotto. To the purest Christian inspiration they added a feeling of nature and a care for exactness of detail that were unknown before their time. Eugene IV deserves credit for divining the genius of Masaccio, that young painter whose masterful frescoes, by reacting against the pranks of certain disciples of Giotto, became a source of inspiration for the whole Florentine art of the fifteenth century. The Pope wanted Masaccio to execute the frescoes with which he intended to decorate the basilicas of St. Clement and St. John Lateran.

---

[11] Petrarch, *Le rime,* I, p. 192.

[12] On Petrarch, see Nolhac, *Pétrarque et l'humanisme;* Mézières, *Pétrarque d'après les documents inédits;* Fuzet, *Pétrarque, ses erreurs, ses voyages, sa vie chrétienne,*

Pisanello and Gentile were merely the precursors of a painter greater than themselves, one whose mystical inspiration was never surpassed by anyone, Fra Angelico da Fiesole, of the Order of St. Dominic. About 1445, at the age of sixteen, he was sent to Rome by Eugene IV. Under this Pope and his successor, Nicholas V, Fra Angelico filled Rome, Florence, Pisa, and Umbria with incomparable marvels.[13] The pure Christian tradition of which Fra Angelico[14] was the most illustrious representative was perpetuated in the Umbrian school, until Benozzo Gozzoli, the admirable painter of the "Triumph of Saint Thomas Aquinas," abandoned the gentle mystical visions of his master and devoted himself to the painting of purely human beauty, and until Perugino, discouraged in his art and perhaps in his faith by the death of Savonarola, allowed the passionate naturalism of Signorelli to triumph.

Even at Rome pagan sensualism began to take root in the time of the illustrious Dominican. Beside the pious and entrancing mural frescoes which Fra Angelico painted for Nicholas V's study,[15] that Pope called upon Andrea del Castagno and Pietro della Francesca to execute some paintings whose realistic style already presaged the over-sensual art of Filippo Lippi.

The sculpture of the period is guilty of the same tendency. The Florentine Donatello, whom Cosimo de' Medici commissioned to restore the ancient statues of his native city, took too much of his inspiration in religious art from these pagan works. His *Christ of Santa Croce* in Florence, his *Magdalen* in the baptistery of the same city, and his *St. John the Baptist* in the Lateran do not elevate the thought above purely natural beauty; and the bronze[16] doors of St. Peter's, carved in the time of Eugene IV, under Donatello's direction, at the very entrance to the most venerable temple of Christendom, contain immoral scenes of pagan mythology.[17]

---

[13] On Fra Angelico, see Rio, *De l'art chrétien,* II, pp. 283-344; Cochin, *Fra Angelico;* Sortais, *Fra Angelico;* Guiraud, *op. cit.,* pp. 123, 201.

[14] The word *Angelico* is a surname given to Santi Torini to express the angelic character that he gave to the personages in his paintings.

[15] The studio of Nicholas V became the chapel of St. Lawrence. Fra Angelico's paintings may still be seen there, portraying the chief scenes in St. Stephen's life.

Artistic technique made remarkable progress at this time. Donatello's models are expressive from head to foot; linear perspective, created by Brunellesco, was carried to perfection in the bas-reliefs of the admirable Florentine artist; the sketches of Pietro della Francesca and Andrea Orcagna reveal a consummate knowledge of foreshortening; artistic anatomy began to be studied scientifically; by the incomparable purity of its lines, by the ravishing harmony of its colors, and by the scientific correctness of its design, this revived art of the Renaissance might in its own way praise God if it could preserve the religious purity of its primitive inspiration. But more than one artist, painter, sculptor, or architect, was forgetful of it, and we need not wonder, therefore, that naturalism soon invaded the Christian temple itself.

When Nicholas V desired to rebuild St. Peter's basilica on a new plan, he entrusted the work to the Florentine, Leone Battista Alberti, a canon by nepotism, an artist by vocation, but by nature and inclination a dilettante and a skeptic. Alberti had just become famous by his construction of the Pitti palace at Florence, with its noble and severe style of architecture, and by the publication of his great work *De re aedificatoria,* from which all idea of religious symbolism was systematically excluded. Bramante's influence, and later that of Carlo Maderna and Bernini, accentuated this movement towards a new style of architecture, in which, by the help of an art carried to perfection, decoration stifled the idea. Undoubtedly a harmonious grouping of garlands and balustrades, of tassels and foliage, of rostra and trophies, delightfully rest the eyes; but Christendom no longer witnessed the rise of those marvelous Gothic cathedrals whose softened light, sifting through stained glass, is so congenial to recollection, whose slender columns, rising high and losing themselves in the shadows, are so elevating to flights of prayer, whose inexhaustible symbolism opens such entrancing perspectives to the spirit of meditation.

---

[16] At that time called the *silver* doors, because they were covered with silver.

[17] On the doors of St. Peter's basilica were represented subjects taken from the immoral fables of pagan mythology: Jupiter and Ganymede, Hero and Leander, the Nymph and the Centaur, Leda and the Swan. It is, however, worthy of remark, as Broussolle states (*L'art, la religion, et la renaissance,* p. 40), that these pagan subjects are to be found only in the foliage of the stiles and consequently are rather hidden from view.

Thus also did the speculations of thinkers and lofty minds of the time less and less favor the elevation of the soul. In the course of 1431 there appeared, in the form of dialogues between apostolic secretaries, a book entitled *De voluptate.* Its author, Lorenzo Valla, was himself one of that crowd. He maintained that sensual pleasure is man's only real good. As this work gave offence, Valla published a second treatise, *De vero bono,* in which the same doctrines were set forth with certain attenuations of expression. The form being now less brutal, made the odious substance all the more dangerous.

Since the publication of the numerous intimate letters of that period, it may now be affirmed that lewd conversations did take place in this college of apostolic secretaries, founded by the popes of Avignon to encourage scholars and literary men. There you might meet Filelfa, a man devoid of morals, who had gone to Constantinople to study Greek under the famous Chrysoloras and then pilfered his fortune and corrupted his daughter;[18] Loschi, who was no less eager to gather rich prebends than to collect old manuscripts; and Leonardo Bruni

---

[18] Guiraud, p. 237.

(Aretino), who composed a pretended discourse of Heliogabalus, full of disgusting cynicism.[19]

In this same company was Poggio, "one of the most repulsive figures of the period," [20] in whom were combined, though with less talent, something of Voltaire's malicious irony and Renan's wavering dilettantism. Poggio, who entered Rome with five coppers in his pocket, became, by virtue of his flattery, one of the churchmen with the highest income. For fifty years, under seven successive pontificates, he succeeded in keeping his position of apostolic secretary. In 1449, when he had reached the age of seventy, he published his *Liber facetiarum,* a collection of most obscene jokes, which revealed the vileness of his soul.[21] This happened under Nicholas V.

---

[19] *Ibid.,* p. 308.

[20] Pastor, I, p. 29.

[21] Guiraud, pp. 98, 152, 295–307. We may naturally wonder how such persons could be tolerated by popes like Martin V, whose life was strict and irreproachable, Eugene IV, who gave an example of monastic virtues, and Nicholas V, who, notwithstanding an excessive fondness for humanism, was sincerely pious. It is but just to remark that the immorality of Poggio and his friends was not well-known until the posthumous publication of their correspondence. While these men were still alive, it was quite possible for the popes to be deceived as to their true sentiments, quite possible to regard certain expressions in their writings as literary fancies. This is, in fact, the impression which they give. Guiraud says: "The popes seemed not to perceive that revival of paganism or, if they did observe it, they did not take it seriously." (*Op. cit.,* p. 308.) Moreover, the scholarship of these men was considerable. To Poggio we owe priceless finds: he discovered Quintilian, Silius Italicus, Lucretius, Ammianus Marcellinus, and a portion of Cicero. Lorenzo Valla was the first to contest, in a scientific way, the authenticity of Christ's alleged *Letter to Abgar,* of Constantine's act of donation, of the redaction of the Apostles' Creed by the twelve apostles, etc. In the papal circle were personages of the highest integrity, such as Cardinal Albergati, Blessed Aleman (cardinal), Blessed Traversari, Cardinal Bessarion, and Cardinal Nicholas of Cusa, who were in relation with Poggio, Valla, and Filelfa. The learning of these humanists and the usefulness of their services cloaked their faults from the eyes of the Roman court, which needed their help to give the chancery acts that literary polish so highly valued at that time. Their unfamiliarity with worldly matters has been generally blamed and brought about no small difficulties for those who had to take the initiative in such affairs. Finally, the troubles of the period occupied the close attention of the popes. A Gregory VII or a Pius V, in short, a saint, would doubtless have courageously faced all these obstacles. But it must be acknowledged that the popes of this epoch had neither the vision to foresee the harmful influence

The appearance of Poggio's *Facetiae* opened the eyes even of the blindest. "It was only then," says Guiraud, "that it became possible to measure the depth of indecency in him who had written them and in that gathering of literary men who took delight in them." [22] Callistus III, Pius II, and Paul II fulfilled their duty as defenders of morality. We have seen how Paul II, by a single stroke, suppressed that section of the "college of secretaries" known as the "college of abbreviators," in which most of these lascivious humanists were to be found. It is true that before long the college of abbreviators [23] was reëstablished by Sixtus IV; but thereafter pagan humanism felt that it was under suspicion at Rome and gathered about the Medici at Florence.

Greek Literary Culture at Florence

In his *Divina Commedia* Dante bewailed that his native city had abandoned the virtuous austerity of former times and in a melancholy strain celebrated the days when

> Florence, within the ancient boundary
> From which she taketh still her tierce and nones
> Abode in quiet, temperate and chaste.
> No golden chain she had, nor coronal,
> Nor ladies shod with sandal shoon, nor girdle
> That caught the eye more than the person did.

---

which these literary and licentious men could exercise, nor did they have the courage, when they did suspect the danger, to unmask them and the strength to remove them before they gave grave scandal. It is characteristic of weak authority to close its eyes to abuses, the revelation of which would embarrass it by obliging it to use severe measures.

[22] Guiraud, preface, p. xiii.

[23] The abbreviators were divided into abbreviators of the major park and abbreviators of the minor park, because of the railed-off enclosures in which they worked. It was their function to prepare summaries of briefs and other papal acts. As a matter of fact, the office was almost a sinecure, intended to supply honorable pensions for literary men. The College of Abbreviators was reorganized by Leo X and finally suppressed by Pius X's Bull "*Sapienti consilio*" (June 29th, 1908).

No houses had she void of families,
Not yet had thither come Sardanapalus
To show what in a chamber can be done.[24]

Since the day when the poet wrote these lines, luxury and immorality had grown worse in the brilliant Tuscan city. The opulent Medici family, enriched by its great commerce, had acquired a preponderant influence, but in these titled merchants nothing recalled the chivalric spirit of the feudal nobles. Cosimo I (de' Medici), known as Cosimo the Elder, in speaking of the crusade undertaken by Pius II, had been heard to say that the Pope "was an old man and had undertaken the enterprise of a young one"; and Machiavelli relates that one of this great lord's favorite maxims was that "a State cannot be held by the man who is always telling his beads." [25] His grandson Lorenzo, whose sumptuous lavishness won him the name of "the Magnificent," dreamed of uniting in Florence everything the most dazzling that art and letters could offer.

At this time a number of Greek scholars, forced out of Constantinople by the Turkish conquest, sought an asylum in Europe. Lorenzo de' Medici did his best to attract and retain the most eminent of them. Thus he welcomed the learned Demetrius Chalcocondylas, who was said to be as remarkable for the polish of his manners as for the extent of his learning. Chalcocondylas for twenty years taught the Florentines Greek, introducing them to the beauties of Homer. Along with him was to be found Gemistus Plethon; it was this Byzantine Platonist who, at the time of the Council of Florence, appeared in the Grand Duke's palace with a mysterious manuscript and read the Dialogues of the "Divine Plato" to a little group of hearers.

About these Greeks, who opened the eyes of the Florentines to the classical beauties of Greek antiquity, there gathered

---

[24] *Paradiso;* Longfellow's translation, canto 15, verses 97 sqq.

[25] Machiavelli, *History of Florence,* p. 317.

Italian humanists, the most celebrated of whom were Pico della Mirandola, Pomponius Laetus, Angiolo Politian, and Marsilio Ficino.

Giovanni Pico, of the princes of Mirandola and Concordia, was a precocious scholar who, at the early age of ten years, won renown as an orator and a poet, was admitted to the University of Bologna at the age of fourteen, and at the age of twenty-three challenged all the scholars of the world to a public discussion of 900 theses *de omni re scibili.*[26] Pico was an adventurous scholar, dreaming of a revival of religion by a more critical study of the sacred texts and a more attentive comparison with ancient religions; he was also a daring thinker, affirming that sin, limited in time, can never merit eternal punishment, that Christ did not descend into hell save in a virtual manner, and that no science can better prove the divinity of Christ than magic.[27] By a brief dated August 4th, 1486, Innocent VIII condemned the 900 theses of Pico della Mirandola. The young scholar humbly submitted. A few years later he died, at the age of thirty-one, in one of his villas near Florence, at the very moment when, by the influence of Savonarola, he was disabused of the world's vanities and of human knowledge and was thinking of entering the Order of St. Dominic.[28]

Pomponius Laetus (1425–1497), whose real name was

---

[26] It seems that the words *de omni re scibili,* which could refer only to questions included in the programme of university studies, were not in the title of the thesis. At any rate, the words *et de quibusdam aliis* are Voltaire's invention.

[27] Tiraboschi, *Storia della lett. ital.,* VI, p. 32; Pastor, V, p. 343.

[28] Pico della Mirandola, shortly before his death, addressed Alexander VI in a memoir containing an exposition of his personal views as to the condemned propositions. The Pope, in a special brief, assured him that he had never been judged guilty of personal or formal heresy. It has sometimes been maintained that Alexander VI thus contradicted his predecessor and approved the famous theses. (See *Il Rosmini* for 1889.) But this is a mistake. Alexander's brief exculpated Pico only from *formal* heresy, that is, personal and imputable, and approved only the ideas set forth in the memoir. Cf. Tripepi in *Il papato,* XXI, pp. 37 sqq., and Pastor, V, 344.

Giulio, lord of Sanseverino, belonged, like Pico della Mirandola, to the upper Italian nobility. He took his surname from Roman antiquity, quite convinced of the influence which an habitual appellation might have on the character and moral worth of a man.[29] Giulio Sanseverino thought to make himself an ancient and succeeded only too well in this. His two young daughters, who were trained in his school and like him were thoroughly devoted to the study of pagan antiquity, collaborated with him in his works, the subjects of which were the political, administrative, and sacerdotal institutions of ancient Rome. After Paul II's dissolution of the famous Roman Academy, of which he was the president, he settled at Florence in 1468. Pomponius Laetus lived and died in a pagan atmosphere, which seems to have extinguished in him the Christian spirit which Pico della Mirandola kept so much alive in his soul.[30]

Angiolo Politian (1454–1494), who belonged to the Cinci family, accomplished still more for the propagation of pagan culture. Trained in the school of the best masters, endowed with a capacity for work that enabled him to pass whole nights poring over ancient manuscripts, gifted with a brilliant imagination by means of which he was able to resurrect a forgotten world in his interpretation of some old text, Angiolo Politian, at the age of twenty-nine, was the most brilliant professor of Florence. Men came from England and Germany to hear his lectures. With misshapen features, an enormous nose, and a neck clumsily joined to his irregular trunk, the first sight of him provoked amazement.[31] But so soon as he opened his mouth, his hearers felt themselves seized and led along by a master mind. The compelling sweetness and sonorousness of his speech, the expression of his face and gestures soon communicated to his listeners the emotion that vibrated in his frame. While he explained the masterpieces of classical antiquity, often a point of delicate sarcasm (*salsa comitas*) would opportunely relieve the tension of his hearers hanging on his words.[32] At times, on the conclusion of his brilliant lectures, Lorenzo the Magnificent would condescend to take the arm of the beloved and popular professor and walk with him through the streets of Florence; and as the prince and the scholar thus passed through the city, they would be greeted everywhere by the flattering murmur of a continual ovation. Under the canon's hood, which the Medici influence obtained for him, Angiolo Politian remained one of the most thoroughgoing pagans of his age.[33] Nevertheless Lorenzo de' Medici thought it right to entrust to the brilliant humanist the education of his young son Giovanni, who, himself a canon at the age of fourteen, was one day to become Pope Leo X.

---

[29] Bayle, *Dictionnaire historique* (art. "*Platina*"), XII, p. 164.

[30] Professor Zabughin, in a scholarly study (*Giulio Pomponio Leto*), asserts that, contrary to the generally accepted opinion, there is not in the works of Leto the least trace of immorality.

[31] "*Erat facie nequaquam ingenua et liberali, ab enormi nasu subluscoque collo.*" (Jovius, *Elogia doctorum*, ch. 38.)

Above all these fine scholars there rose, by the vigor of his mind, one who should be regarded as the very leader and head of the Florentine Renaissance, the founder of the Academy of Florence, Marsilio Ficino (1433–1499). We shall soon have occasion to speak of his philosophical work. But the Platonist doctrine of which Ficino was the protagonist, penetrated the minds of the fifteenth century so deeply only because of the delicate art with which he knew how to present his ideas.

---

[32] One of his hearers has expressed in Latin verse that, in listening to Politian explaining Virgil, you could almost hear the gentle, murmuring voice of the sonorous pine and the babbling brook flowing over the shining, pebbly bottom, and the echo playfully repeating the poet's verses.

Hic resonat blando tibi pinus ancata susurro,
Pura coloratos intestrepit unda lapillos,
Hic ludit nostri captatrix carminis Echo.

[33] Pico della Mirandola, after his conversion, endeavored to lead Politian back to the Christian spirit. One day, while the illustrious canon was reading to his friend a poem written in honor of letters, Pico rested his charming head on Politian's deformed shoulder and whispered: "Foolish Politian, wearying yourself searching in man's art for what is to be found only in the love of God!" The canon smiled and continued to read.

Without being so deformed as Politian, the founder of the neo-Platonic school was ill-favored by nature. It is related that at his baptism the priest could not help smiling "at the sight of that tiny morsel of humanity that could have found room in the little silk slipper of a Florentine lady."

Marsilio Ficino was sickly all his life; being susceptible to changes of temperature, he would find his genius dry up when the sky became cloudy and would recover his inspiration only under the brightness of a clear blue sky. The object of all his labors were the works of Plato. In order the better to penetrate the meaning of his favorite philosopher, he studied Greek with the greatest masters, pitilessly burned up his first attempts at translation, and revised his work with tireless perseverance. Of his translation of Plato, Villari says: "To this day, notwithstanding the progress achieved in Hellenic philology, Ficino's version still holds its place in the public esteeem." [34]

Architecture and Painting

Such influences on the part of the masters of thought were sure to accelerate the movement which was gradually paganizing architecture and sculpture. After Poggio's discovery of Vitruvius' treatise and its publication, Gothic was abandoned and there was a return to the semicircular form, to Doric,

---

[34] Villari, I, p. 58. An anecdote, recorded by Tiraboschi in his *Storia della letteratura italiana,* relates that, after spending two years in the study of Plato's works, Marsilio Ficino presented one of his manuscripts to the great Duke Cosmo. The latter, who was an accomplished Hellenist, turned over a few pages, smiled, and shook his head. Marsilio understood and thereupon began a deeper study of Greek under the celebrated Platina. He revised his work and submitted it to the criticism of the famous Hellenist, Marcus Musurus. While Ficino was reading his manuscript to Musurus, the latter coolly took his inkstand, as he might have taken a box of gold dust, and poured the ink on Ficino's manuscript. Marsilio, who had learned from Plato that a wise man never gives way to impatience, set to work again and, after a few years, brought Lorenzo the Magnificent his masterpiece, which won the prince's admiration and that of posterity.

Ionic, and Corinthian, or rather composite columns, for Greek architecture was scarcely known, except through the transformations which it underwent at the hands of the Romans. Church façades were ornamented with motives derived from Roman triumphal arches. The wonderful architect Brunellesco, who raised the cupola of the Florence cathedral to a height of more than 300 feet, borrowed from antiquity a great abundance of decorations in his construction of the Strozzi chapel.

The sculptural art was more timid; Ghiberti (1378–1456), the celebrated sculptor of the bronze doors of the Florence baptistery, and Luca della Robbia (1400–1482), the great terra cotta artist, tried to reconcile Christian idealism with a closer observation of anatomical forms and beauty of lines, and thus brought about a transition between the Gothic art of the Middle Ages and the new art of the Renaissance. Donatello (1383–1466) with equal genius expressed the asceticism of St. John the Baptist and the ironical smile of Poggio, the noble attitude of St. George, so much admired by Raphael, and the licentious cynicism of the famous "Zuccone" which ornaments the campanile of Florence.

Painting, more closely attached to the representation of religious scenes, more subject to the control of a people still Christian, resisted pagan influences for a longer time. A marvelous poetry still illumined the melancholy figures of Filippo Lippi (1406–1469). Yet the moral weaknesses of the poor artist already showed themselves in his works. "It is with him that painting, while still remaining at the service of the Church, departed from its purely religious spirit." [35] The study of the nude and of motion became the artist's chief objective.

Filippino Lippi, Botticelli, and Ghirlandajo accentuated the master's style. Filippo's son, Filippino Lippi, lacked inventiveness, but was a ready artist, productive, ingenious, and elegant; his pictures rarely show the mystical vision which inspired his father's brush. Botticelli, for seven years a pupil of Lippi, strayed still farther from the Christian ideal and, at the request of Lorenzo the Magnificent, multiplied pagan subjects in his paintings; his "Birth of Venus," in which all is fair, shining, and springlike, smiling and singing joyful strains of youth and dawn,[36] was the most perfect expression of the sensual paganism that was everywhere insinuating itself in Italy. Domenico Ghirlandajo (1449–1494) more nearly approached the great geniuses by the severe simplicity of his composition, the beauty of his types, and the purity of his taste; but in his incomparable frescoes the human ideal more and more takes the place of heavenly vision.

---

[35] Lavisse and Rambaud, IV, p. 588. Cf. Charles Blanc, *Histoire des peintres, École florentine,* pp. 3, 8.

However, the technique of the art helped to develop its progress. Antonello da Messina brought from Flanders to Italy painting in oil, which greatly increased the resources of esthetic expression; Andrea Mantegna, whom Innocent VIII called to Rome, revealed a knowledge of coloring and perspective no less precise than that of Signorelli and more deeply penetrated with Christian symbolism; Verrochio (1435–1488), the master of Leonardo da Vinci, Lorenzo di Credi, and many others, by the skill of their methods, the pleasing firmness of their design, and the finish of their paintings and sculptures, heralded the appearance of the three great geniuses who carried the art of the Renaissance to its apogee: Raphael, Michelangelo, and Leonardo da Vinci.

In literary circles the decadence of the Christian spirit was still more marked. Men were no longer satisfied to turn their back on the ideal of the Middle Ages; they made fun of it. The buffoon-poet Pulci, in his "Morgante Maggiore," composed at the request of Lorenzo de' Medici, turned the heroes of chivalry into ridicule. Even cardinals scarcely dared call the Holy Ghost, the Blessed Virgin, and Heaven by their traditional names. Cardinal Bembo spoke of the "celestial Zephyr" and the "lauretain goddess"; the truly virtuous Bessarion, in lamenting the death of Gemistus Plethon, expressed the hope that this great man might "join the celestial spirits in the mystic dance of Bacchus." [37]

---

[36] Blanc, *op. cit.*, p. 2.

What was only a Platonic fancy in the words of these serious persons, unfortunately became a reality with more than one churchman of the time. If we are to credit Sanudo's journal and Molmenti's accounts, many princes of the Church did not scruple to take part in dances. Lorenzo the Magnificent made a collection of dance songs.[38] Marsilio Ficino, who wrote a Christian apologetic that was not without value, kept a lamp burning before the statue of Plato; [39] and Lorenzo the Magnificent, surrounded by his literary court, when he would ascend the hill of Fiesole towards evening, was wont to repeat a sonnet composed to the glory of "that over-soul" which spreads out from the center of the universe into all the members composing it.[40]

Influence of Savonarola

We have already had occasion to remark that the Christian conscience was shocked at such sights. From the very monastery of Fiesole from which Fra Angelico came, a group of Friars Preachers had come to Florence and there founded the monastery of San Marco, where Savonarola preached. But some time before him, St. Bernardine of Siena, St. John Capistran, Albert Berdini of Sarteano, Giles of Viterbo, and many others had forcibly denounced the shameless paganism which was being displayed in arts, letters, and morals.

---

[37] Villari, *Savonarole et son temps.* Translator's preface, p. xxviii.

[38] Sanudo, *I diarii,* XXVII, 30; Molmenti, *La storia di Venezia,* p. 279; Castil-Blaze, *La danse et les ballets,* p. 15; Rodocanachi, *La danse en Italie du XV^e^ au XVIII^e^ siècle,* in the *Revue des Études Historiques,* Nov.–Dec., 1905.

[39] Villari, *loc. cit.*

[40] *"Per la tua providenza, fai, s'infonda*
L'anima in mezzo del gran corpo, donde
Conviene in tutti membri si diffonda."

It is worthy of remark that the great preacher of Florence did not content himself with thundering against pagan morals. It would be an exaggeration to speak of a school of art founded by Savonarola, yet the Christian influence which the celebrated friar exercised over the artists of his time is indubitable. Savonarola induced Lorenzo di Credi to turn over to him several pagan studies which he burned in the public square, and he obtained from the painter a promise to show more respect to the dignity of his art in future. The three Robbias had a deep veneration for the Prior of San Marco. Although Botticelli long remained refractory to his influence, yet after the death of the friar who had reproved him, the painter desired to end his days in austere penance. It is said that we owe many of Donatello's Christian masterpieces to Savonarola's solicitations and, if we are to accept the word of Vasari, the architect Simone Cronaca paid a sort of cult to the bold reformer.

The paganism of the literati, being deeper, was harder to combat than that of the artists. Yet we know the decisive influence Fra Girolamo exercised over Pico della Mirandola. Marsilio Ficino followed his sermons for a while and was deeply moved by them; Guicciardini could not help paying homage in his writings to the merits of Savonarola,[41] and Lorenzo the Magnificent himself must also have felt his influence, since, on his death-bed, he sent for the friar to hear his confession.

Savonarola's influence over the artists continued after his death; it was extended to the three great geniuses whose names illumine the sixteenth century. Raphael, who in his "Disputa" placed Savonarola in the midst of the greatest

[41] Guicciardini, *Opere inedite,* III, ch. 13.

doctors of the Church, was only fifteen years old at the time of the "prophet's" death; but he felt Savonarola's inspiration through his connection with Fra Bartolommeo, one of the friar's faithful disciples. Michelangelo, who had heard Savonarola preach, always entertained a great veneration for his writings.[42] Leonardo da Vinci, the friend of Fra Bartolommeo, Botticelli, Filippi,[43] and almost all the close friends of Savonarola, experienced at least the indirect influence of the friar.

The naturalistic and pagan aspects of the works of these three great masters have often been pointed out. Undoubtedly more than once did their devotion to plastic form seem to hide from them the religious ideal so preponderant in medieval works of art; but it is just to recognize that under their influence, according as "the legendary world saw the boundaries of its empire gradually restricted, those of the historical world became more exact and strengthened in view of the coming requirements of the modern spirit."[44] In the works of Raphael, Michelangelo, and Leonardo, the iconography of the Saviour and His Apostles was more strongly inspired by the Gospel facts. When Protestantism attacked the dogmas of St. Peter's primacy and the Eucharist, the people received the reply of history and art at the same time, by contemplating the pictures of these great masters. By means of attentive study, it has been possible to show how the Stanze of the Vatican, by the *ensemble* of their decoration, constitute a new and wonderfully opportune argument for the divinity of the Church. How could one set into better light the social import of the Eucharist than in the "Disputa"? Did not Leonardo da Vinci's "Last Supper," so widely reproduced, revive the memory of Judas' treason by dramatically picturing it before the eyes of the people? Was it possible more strikingly to represent all humanity, sublimely idealized, taking part in the sacrifice of salvation, than by the wonderful ceiling of the Sistine Chapel? [45] Was not the whole artistic career of Michelangelo like a religious drama? [46]

---

[42] *"Ebbe in gran venerazione le opere scritte di Savonarola."* (Vasari.)

[43] In 1898 Villari edited an unpublished life of Savonarola, written by Fillipepi, a brother of the painter Botticelli.

[44] Broussolle, *op. cit.*, p. 254.

The artistic ideal of the great Florentine preacher kept itself purer and more untainted in the school of his faithful disciple Fra Bartolommeo. It was also perpetuated at Florence in the convent of Santa Sabina, where Sister Plautilla Nelli brilliantly displayed her artistic talent. The memory of the Dominican friar was preserved there with pious care: it was by his advice and under his auspices that the study of painting was combined with exercises of piety.[47]

At the beginning of the sixteenth century it might have been expected that, thanks to Savonarola and his disciples, the inspiration of the Gospel would counterbalance the pagan spirit of the Renaissance. We shall presently see, in studying the ramifications of the humanist movement in Germany, France, and England, that, under quite different aspects, the same hope there seemed to be reasonable. But just when Fra Bartolommeo was leaving this world (1517), Luther was shouting his cry of revolt. Unforeseen events and entirely new influences came to modify all predictions and expectations.[48]

---

[45] *Ibid.*, pp. 112, 340, 388, 395.

[46] Michelangelo's work is especially significant from the point of view of the development of religious art. Often we are surprised at the striking contrast between the man's mysticism and the brutal crudity of his masterpieces. Perhaps we do not reflect that the powerful figures of the Sistine Chapel and the formidable Moses at St. Peter in Chains were preceded by masterpieces of serene beauty, like the Pietà at St. Peter's, and likewise followed by scenes of the purest religious inspiration, such as the Deposition in the Duomo at Florence. It would seem that the great artist, having started out with the gentlest emotions of faith, met on his road that pagan beauty which had become an idol to his contemporaries and which triumphed over him by a genial effort that left its trace in his work.

[47] Rio, *De l'art chrétien*, II, p. 458.

[48] Lafenestre, *Saint François d'Assise et Savonarole, inspirateurs de l'art italien.*

Philosophy and Theology

Similar deceptions were produced at the same time in the sphere of philosophical and religious thought. Scholastic philosophy in the twelfth century had called forth mighty activities of mind among the disciples of Peter Lombard and the monks of St. Victor, and in the thirteenth century was set forth with masterful genius in the syntheses of St. Thomas Aquinas and St. Bonaventure. But in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, whether we should attribute this decline to the excessive multiplication of universities which led to a scattering of the workers, or to the rivalries of certain religious Orders all too ready to substitute irritating and superficial polemics for quiet and fruitful study, or to that relaxation which always seems to follow periods of great labor in the realm of speculation as in that of action, or to the discredit which suddenly fell upon the heavy and barbarous phraseology of the Scholastic doctors in the minds of masters trained in the prose of Cicero—it is a fact that men abandoned the noble theses to lose themselves in verbal disputes, that they wore themselves out searching for subtle distinctions: they argued more than they reasoned; they reckoned authorities more than they weighed arguments; they were Thomist, Scotist, or Augustinian according as they belonged to the Order of St. Dominic, or that of St. Francis, or that of St. Augustine, to the university of Paris or to that of Oxford.[49] Capreolus of Rodez (1380–1444), the "Prince of Thomists," as he was called, vainly strove to have the *Summa* of St. Thomas accepted as the classical manual in teaching. In his monumental *Liber defensionum theologiae divi doctoris Thomae*, he provided a sort of encyclopedia of Thomistic doctrines; but "certain defects of method derived from the decaying Scholasticism" [50] prevented his work from obtaining the favor that its intrinsic worth deserved.

---

[49] De Wulf, *History of Medieval Philosophy*, p. 486.

[50] *Ibid.*, p. 436.

Gabriel Biel of Tübingen (1430–1495), surnamed "the Last of the Schoolmen," [51] exercised a more telling influence on the movement of ideas because of the nature of the questions that he treated. His great work, *Collectorium circa quatuor sententiarum libros,* learnedly and systematically arranged, contained original views on individual and social morality. His ideas on the rights of property, the theory of money, loaning at interest, a just wage, the rights of war, the conditions of commerce, the origin of power, etc., attracted attention; unfortunately his dogmatic hardihood disturbed men's minds.[52] He was frankly a nominalist of Occam's school.[53] He taught that the Sacrament of Penance was simply a pledge that the sins have been pardoned by an internal act of the virtue of penance; [54] that the causality of the Sacraments is purely moral, in this sense, that at the moment the rite is performed, God produces the grace; [55] that the independence of the divine will is absolute, able to create morality, to make just what would be otherwise unjust; [56] that the pope, having no power contrary to Scripture, to natural or divine right, has a claim to obedience only insofar as he keeps within the limits of his competency.[57] Luther in his monastery studied Biel and did not fail to exploit these ideas of the Tübingen theologian in favor of his own doctrines.

Towards the end of the 15th century, a young doctor of the

---

[51] So called because he was the last commentator of Peter Lombard.

[52] Cf. Janssen, *L'Allemagne et la Réforme,* I, pp. 109, 476.

[53] The Nominalism of the fourteenth century was a reaction against the formalism of Duns Scotus, which excessively increased the number of metaphysical forms of entities. The Nominalists fell into another excess: they denied metaphysical realities, or at least saw in words only symbols of unknowable realities. (See De Wulf, *op. cit.,* p. 418.)

[54] *Collectorium,* bk. 4, dists. 14, 16, 17, 18.

[55] *Ibid.,* dist. 6, q. 2.

[56] *Ibid.,* bk. 1, dist. 2, q. 11; dist. 5, q. 1; dist. 10, q. 1; dist. 11, q. 1; dist. 34.

[57] *Ibid.,* bk. 3, dist. 34; bk. 4, dist. 15, q. 8.

Order of St. Dominic, Tommaso de Vio, better known as Cajetan, professor at Padua, then at Pavia, gave Thomism the powerful renewal that it needed. But the period of decadence of Scholasticism had lasted too long. Divergent schools sprang up. At the side of traditional Thomism, often in conflict with it, there developed the heterodox Aristotelianism of Pomponazzi, the semi-pagan Neoplatonism of Marsilio Ficino, an independent philosophy that made use of the name of Nicholas of Cusa, and a dubious mysticism that was connected with Master Eckhart.

The deeper knowledge of Greek which they possessed led scholars to read Aristotle's works in the original. There they discovered, or at least pretended to discover, profound differences between the traditional interpretation which the Middle Ages had given to the Stagirite and the literal sense of his writings. What could there be in common between the Christian dogma of a personal God, the Creator of the world, and the Aristotelian theory of *"actus purus,"* thought of thought, eternally coexisting with matter that was independent of him, and not concerning himself with the contingent beings that gravitated about his absolute being? How reconcile the dogma of the immortality of the soul with the doctrine of the double intellect, passive and active, the former disappearing with man's body, the latter surviving it only in an everlasting impersonality?

John of Janduno, a doctor of the University of Paris, whose political influence we considered above, declared himself in favor of these later doctrines, which he stubbornly maintained against those of St. Thomas. He taught the eternity of the world, the impersonality of the active intellect (*intellectus agens*), the impossibility of God creating beings or knowing anything except Himself. Moreover, he seems to have admitted the coexistence of two truths, independent of, and sometimes opposed to each other, the one rational, the other revealed. John of Janduno had disciples; in his works he speaks of his *socii.* It has been surmised that he was at the head of a regular school.[58]

We have more precise and abundant information as to the person of Pietro Pomponazzi, a lay professor of the University of Padua, who carried the temerity of philosophical speculation even farther than John of Janduno. This ugly, almost dwarfish little man, learned, spiritual, clownish at times, whose sallies disarmed and amused the cardinals, taught that a philosophical truth may be a theological error, and vice versa.[59] This principle made it convenient for him, under cover of Aristotle, to maintain the most erroneous doctrines, such as the doctrine of the mortality of the soul. His book, *De immortalitate animae,* embodying this thesis, escaped condemnation at the hands of the Holy Office only because of Cardinal Bembo's protection; it was later placed in the number of forbidden books by the Council of Trent.

The temerity of this Neoaristotelianism produced a reaction favorable to the development of that Neoplatonism which, since the foundation of the Academy of Florence by Lorenzo the Magnificent, was winning more and more the best minds. The theories of William Occam, his agnostic theodicy and conceptualist psychology, the determinism of Jean Buridan, the mysticism of Pierre d'Ailly and Jean Gerson had prepared the way for Platonic idealism, if only by their attacks on Scholasticism.[60]

The literary renaissance disposed men's minds towards accepting the poetic dialogues of the head of the Academy. Besides, Ficino's doctrine, so brilliantly set forth in his *Theologia platonica,* was nothing else but Plato's doctrine as interpreted by Plotinus; this poetic mysticism conceived the ensemble of beings, from the eternal God to pure matter, as an imperceptible gradation of being, whereby everything finds a place in a harmonious hierarchical arrangement, bound together without discontinuity. Whereas, in studying Aristotle, they were fond of noting the points which separated him from Christian doctrine, they were, on the contrary, pleased to point out in what the "Divine Plato" approached the Gospel. Would it be possible to consider the teachings of Christ and of the Church as a vast syncretism wherein all the religions of antiquity would providentially meet?[61] Marsilio Ficino seems to maintain this in his treatise *De religione christiana,* wherein, without abandoning the dogma and the traditional proofs of the Church, he seems too much inclined to dissolve Christianity into a sort of enlarged paganism.[62]

---

[58] On John of Janduno, see Noël Valois in *Histoire litteraire,* XXXIII, pp. 528-633; De Wulf, pp. 440 sqq.; Féret, *La faculté de théologie de Paris au Moyen Age,* III, pp. 272–275.

[59] Höffding, *History of Modern Philosophy,* I, 15.

[60] Among the foes of Scholasticism in the fourteenth century, mention should be made of a solitary genius, restless and remarkably daring, Nicholas d'Autrecourt, whose radical subjectivism is not surpassed by Kant's. See De Wulf, pp. 445–450, and Hauréau, *Notices et extraits de quelques manuscripts latins de la Bibliothèque Nationale,* XXXIV, part 2.

At the side of Marsilio Ficino, the celebrated Cardinal Bessarion (died 1472) became the defender of Platonic doctrines; under the title, *Contra calumniatores Platonis,* he published a declaration full of moderate ideas. While admiring Plato as his master, he rejected all the pagan ideas in his Dialogues and gave high praise to Aristotle.

Nicholas Cryfts (1401–1464), better known as Nicholas of Cusa, claimed that he depended neither on Plato nor on Aristotle. It is said that it was in the course of a long voyage, about 1438, when returning from his embassy at Constantinople, the genius of Nicholas of Cusa conceived the vast philosophical system which he developed in his works *De conjecturis temporum, De docta ignorantia, De visione Dei,* etc. Although, in comparing Aristotle with Plato, he seems to lean towards the latter, this was because of his studies in natural science, his administrative and diplomatic career, and his mystical meditations. He always distrusted abstract essences with well-marked outlines: he regarded them as artificially classified and joined together by pure dialectics; and he repeated a supposed saying of St. Ambrose: *"A dialecticis libera me, Domine."* [63]

---

[61] Charles Huit has shown the lively faith that was in Ficino's soul. But, for Ficino, the study of Plato was a Christian work. Hence came his maxim, "*Qui te ad Platonem, ad Ecclesiam vocat.*" (*Annales de philosophie chrétienne,* pp. 370–372.)

[62] The treatise *De religione christiana,* except for this vague tendency, is a most original and remarkable essay in apologetics. The extrinsic proofs of religion are supplemented and completed by intrinsic proofs. Cf. Brugère, *De vera religione,* preface, p. xiv.

His conception of God and the world has induced many historians of philosophy to regard him as one of the originators of modern philosophical thought.[64] He protested against every form of pantheism; but several of his views seem to favor a compenetration of God and the world that is hardly reconcilable with orthodoxy. Against the geocentric and dualistic theory of the universe, he fought intensely. This theory, by placing the earth in the center of all creation, established a radical opposition between the terrestrial world, which is contingent and corruptible, and the celestial world, which is immutable and incorruptible. In a sense, however, according to him, man is the center of the universe, because he sums up all beings in himself by being the representation of them, as God sums them up by possessing the reality of them. In the teaching of Nicholas of Cusa, God is not, in fact, a Being separated from creatures, as He is represented in the Aristotelian conception; He is the infinite Being in whom all beings meet, unite, and are reconciled, even contradictories (*"omnium rerum complicatio . . . etiam contradictoriarum"*). Man, he says, can know finite beings only by their differentiations *(alteritates)*, and the infinite Being only by a supernatural intuition. The principle of knowledge, according to our philosopher, is a tendency to unite diverse beings. This tendency first of all unifies sense knowledge, and is the part played by the *sensus;* then it unifies man's total perceptions and is thus the function of the *ratio,* which distinguishes the knowing ego from the known world. But if I wish to conceive, beyond me and the world, being and the possible, a supreme unity embracing all, I must go to God; this I can do only with a direct view of the *intellectus*, aided by grace.[65]

---

[63] On the origin of this expression, see *Bulletin de Litt. Ecclés. de l'Inst. Cath. de Toulouse,* January, 1906. (Cf. *P.L.,* XVI, col. 536.)

[64] Fiorentino, *Il risorgimento filosofico del Quattrocento;* Hoffding, *op. cit.,* I, pp. 83–91. Cf. Duhem, *Annales de la Faculté des Lettres de Bordeaux,* April–June, 1907.

Mysticism

When Savonarola approached the religious problem, he did not have the German thinker's vast conceptions; but his *Triumphus crucis,* "the first apologetic in date," says Lacordaire, "and not the last in genius," [66] proceeded from a very personal idea. The *Triumph of the Cross* is divided into four books and aims at demonstrating the truth of Christianity, not by quoting authority,[67] nor by purely rational proof,[68] but by a just inference of the soul, rising from facts it observes or experiences [69] in the external world and in the soul, to faith in God, Christ, and His Church.

Savonarola establishes his apologia of the Christian religion not only on the argument from miracles and prophecies, but on the Christian fact, studied in general history and in each soul, on the needs of the human heart, on the effects of Christianity in its worship, in the works of Christ, in the external and internal life of Christians,[70] and on the comparative study of all non-Christian religions known at that time.[71] A picture, revealing the masterful oratory of the celebrated Dominican, sums up his whole argumentation: it is the *triumph of the cross,* wherein we see Christ, crowned with thorns, standing in a triumphal chariot, drawn by the patriarchs, prophets, and apostles; on both sides are the lines of martyrs, virgins, and confessors; this retinue is followed by a crowd of infidels, the impious, the reprobate, and the persecutors, obliged to acclaim the divine Victor.

---

[65] *De conjecturis temporum.* Cf. Hoffding, I, p. 83; De Wulf, p. 457. Nicholas of Cusa is rightly considered a precursor of Galileo. Yet it must be noted that he did not oppose the geocentric theory in the name of science, but only in the name of philosophy. Moreover he attacked heliocentrism as well as geocentrism, that is, any topocentric theory.

[66] The date of the *Triumphus crucis* is 1472. The apologetic composed by Marsilius Ficino in 1474, under the title of *De religione christianœ,* was not published until after his death, which occurred in 1499.

[67] *"Nullius auctoritate innitemur."* (Procœmium.)

[68] *"Fides principiis et causis naturalibus demonstrari non potest."* (*Ibid.*)

[69] *"Innitemur soli rationi ex iis quae videmus et experimur."* (*Ibid.*)

In this work of the friar of San Marco, philosophical thought is mingled with that mystical inspiration which had been showing itself for a century with a vivacity that was sometimes disturbing. "What availeth us the knowledge of genera and species?" said the author of the *Imitation.* "Let all doctors be still in Thy presence, and do Thou only, Lord, speak to my soul." By St. Catherine of Siena in Italy, by St. Brigid in Sweden, by Jean Gerson in France, by the disciples of Gerard de Groote and Thomas à Kempis in Germany and Holland, mysticism—that is, according to the definition of its greatest teacher, "the study and experience of things divine" [72] —had spread along safe paths, clear of the bizarre notions of the "Spirituals." While the body of the Church, in the person of the most eminent representatives of its hierarchy, seemed to be too satisfied in the domain of semi-pagan naturalism and human policy, it has been said that the soul of the Church advanced, as with a mighty leap, towards the loftiest realms of mysticism.

---

[70] *Triumphus crucis,* part 2, chaps. 10–16.

[71] *Ibid.,* part 4.

[72] Dionysius the Areopagite, *On the Divine Names,* 76 (*P.G.,* III, col. 648.)

But the spread of the deep and obscure doctrines of the new mystics, especially of Master Eckhart, was sure to give rise to more than one suspect movement.

The life of Frater Eckhart of Hochheim (d. 1327), of the Order of St. Dominic, better known as "Master Eckhart," is almost unknown. After courses at the universities of Cologne and Paris, he followed the study of St. Thomas Aquinas by that of Dionysius the Areopagite, or the author who wrote under that name. Having been called to give some spiritual conferences to his brethren in religion, to some Dominican sisters, and to some Beguine communities, he inaugurated the practice of preaching in the vulgar tongue and broke away from the method, if not the doctrine, of the Scholastics.[73]

Master Eckhart sought above all to touch the hearts of his hearers by revealing to them the depth of their sins, their truest and innermost aspirations, their profoundest religious needs. Then, in words burning with love, he spoke to them of the meeting of the soul with God, the divine betrothal, the total transformation of created beings into the Uncreated.[74] To express his thoughts, he made use of pithy sayings and sublime metaphors. The movement of the soul towards God he compares to the flight of an eagle rising beyond human ken into limitless space. Thus the soul, successively illumined and raised up by prophetic revelation, by the practice of the Christian life, and by ecstasy,[75] loses itself in "the unfathomable depth," in that infinite God whom he calls in turn "the sublime Nothing," alluding to our powerlessness to speak of Him as we ought, and "the inexhaustible All," referring to the essential destitution of all that is not God.[76]

---

[73] As to how far Master Eckhart followed the method and teaching of St. Thomas, see the discussion between Denifle and Delacroix. Denifle, *Archiv für Literatur und Kirchengeschichte des Mittelalters*, II, p. 421; Delacroix, *Essai sur le mysticisme spéculatif en Allemagne*, pp. 156, 262.

[74] "*Nos transformamur totaliter in Deum et convertimur in eum.*" (Denzinger, no. 510.)

[75] Denifle, *op. cit.*, V, p. 361.

Master Eckhart had published no writing; but his enthusiastic disciples spread his maxims and often exaggerated them. In 1326, the year preceding the doctor's death, the bishop of Cologne was alarmed and opened an inquiry as to his teaching. Three years later, Pope John XXII condemned 28 propositions attributed to Master Eckhart by his disciples, notably those which in too unqualified terms proclaimed the inefficacy of external works for our sanctification and the powerlessness of our concepts and formulas to express the attributes of the Divinity.[77]

In spite of everything, Eckhart's influence was immense. Blessed John Ruysbroeck, Tauler, and Blessed Henry Suso, who were his orthodox posterity, called him "the Master" and rendered a sort of cult to him.

Ruysbroeck (1294–1381), the ardent contemplative, combined vigorous transports of piety with their brilliant figures and an extreme prudence which guarded him from the illuminism of the Beghards. For him the movement of the soul towards God is like a hunt, directed by the Holy Ghost, who acts in the soul by interior excitations and gives it the feeling and, so to speak, the scent of the divine. Lessius praised him without reserve, and Bossuet has stated, after Bellarmine, that "his teaching has remained uncondemned," because "it is impossible to draw any precise conclusions from his exaggerations" [78]

John Tauler (d. 1361), the profound master of the interior life, set forth his spiritual teaching in his *Institutiones divinae* and *Sermons.* Starting out from the principle that perfection consists in detaching oneself from the world in order to become attached to God, he taught that this is accomplished in us interiorly by destroying the evil recesses of our soul so as to give perfect freedom to God's inspirations. We attain this by renouncing all that is ephemeral and accidental, by mortifying our self-will, by stripping ourselves of all deceptive images and abandoning ourselves to the Holy Ghost.[79]

---

[76] Denifle, *La vie spirituelle d'après les mystiques allemands du XIV^e siècle,* ch. 20 and *passim.*

[77] Denzinger, nos. 516–519, 528. The works of Master Eckhart have become well known only since the middle of the last century. In 1857 Franz Pfeiffer reconstructed Eckhart's German sermons and in 1880 Denifle began the publication of Eckhart's Latin works. (Pfeiffer, *Deutsche Mystiker des vierzehnten Jahrhunderts.*)

[78] Bossuet, *Instruction sur les états d'oraison,* bk. 1.

In certain passages, of which Luther later made abusive use, Tauler seems to regard external works as of small value; but he employs correctives that leave no doubt as to the orthodoxy of his doctrine.[80] St. Francis de Sales strongly recommended the reading of Tauler to St. Jane de Chantal.[81]

Blessed Henry Suso (1295-1366), the inspired chanter of suffering and love, relates in the first part of his *Exemplar* the distressing interior and exterior trials through which God made him pass. But by these very sufferings he reached a joyous love, overflowing with warmth and generosity. He expresses this love in the second part of his *Exemplar,* which he entitles *The Little Book of Eternal Wisdom.* Thiriot says this work was the most widely read book in Germany in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries.[82]

It was in vain that Luther invoked the great mystical theologians of that period in support of his theses; [83] the only ones that could be considered his real precursors are some venturesome spirits, of whom it remains for us to speak in order to complete this sketch of the intellectual movement at the time of the Renaissance.

---

[79] Tauler, *Institutions,* ch. 3; *Sermons,* I, p. 111.

[80] For example, the sermons for the fourth Sunday of Lent and for the eighth and twelfth Sundays after Trinity.

[81] Very little is known of Tauler's life. The story that his conversion was brought about by a layman, who then became his spiritual director, is shown by Denifle to be pure legend.

[82] Thiriot, *Œuvres mystiques du Bienheureux Henri Suso.* Janssen credits Suso and Tauler with a great influence in the formation of German prose. "These mystical writers were the first to reveal the aptitude which the German language possesses for the happy expression of philosophical ideas. They discovered the art of clothing the most subtle and abstract thoughts in clear and precise terms." (Janssen, I, p. 258.)

We have already seen a popular form of false mysticism spreading under the name of "Brethren of the Free Spirit." This sect, which arose in Germany near the end of the thirteenth century, was made up of various communities, some of them directed by priests, others by laymen. They taught the coexistence of two religions: one for the ignorant—the religion of obedience and literal observance; the other for the enlightened—the religion of freedom and of the Spirit.[84]

The Brethren of the Free Spirit managed to have their dangerous doctrines penetrate the communities of Beghards and Beguines, strange associations, half-religious, half-lay, founded at the close of the twelfth century by Lambert le Begue. In the fourteenth century they were widespread in Flanders, Germany, and France. The Council of Vienne (1311) gave notice to the associations of Beghards and Beguines that they were to disperse. But Pope John XXII, when publishing this decision five years later, did not press for its execution; and the Beguinages, centers for the spread of the doctrine of the Free Spirit, often became places of most shameless excesses. The bishops of Strasburg and Cologne, as also Pope Urban V himself, in 1367, were obliged to have recourse to the tribunals of the Inquisition to suppress these scandals.

But the false mysticism found its learned expression in the teaching of three men of great culture, Berthold de Rohrbach, John Wessel of Gröningen, and John Wesel of Erfurt.

---

[83] "Just as the Catholicism of the Middle Ages had associated Aristotle and the theology of the Fathers, so Luther combined Erasmus and the mystic sense." (Boutroux, *Science and Religion in Contemporary Philosophy,* p. 13.) The inexactness of this assertion appears from a simple exposition of the facts.

[84] For further details, see Delacroix, *op. cit.,* pp. 61–66.

To form an idea of the influence exercised by the German doctors of the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, we must consider them in all the prestige which the custom of the times attached to their high functions. These pontiffs of learning uttered their maxims in the manner of oracles, from a sort of elevated throne surmounted by a kind of canopy. When one of them passed along the street, dressed in his long and ample garb and wearing the traditional cap,[85] students respectfully gathered about him as the "master." Several were publicly crowned with laurels in the midst of triumphal ovations.

Berthold de Rohrbach, who was burned at Spires as a heretic at the end of the fourteenth century, had taught from his professorial chair that the man who has reached perfection no longer needs anything but fasting and prayer. This was tantamount to denying the efficacity of good works, at least for the perfect. He also said that for a pious man all food taken in the spirit of faith produced the same effect as the Eucharist, and that a layman urged by the Spirit of God is more useful than a priest. This was an implicit negation of the special efficacy *(opus operatum)* of the Sacraments and of the ecclesiastical hierarchy.[86]

The erudition and dialectic skill of John Wessel (1419–1489) won for him the surnames of *Lux mundi* and *Doctor contradictionum.* Thomas à Kempis had been his teacher; Bessarion, Reuchlin, Agricola, and Francesco della Rovere, the future Sixtus IV, were his friends. Wessel never intended to withdraw from the Roman Church, but his great vivacity led him to employ violent invectives against the abuses of his time, and an excessive independence of mind at times suggested to him new formulas that had a most dubious appearance. He was fond of saying that "to be freed from sin was nothing else but to possess justifying love," that "love is more than all obedience," that "to cleanse us of sin, Christ communicates justice to us." [87]

---

[85] Janssen, I, p. 197.

[86] Hergenröther, V, p. 170.

There is none of these expressions but is susceptible of an orthodox interpretation. But ill-disposed and rebellious minds affected to understand them in a heretical sense. They did not even hesitate to falsify Wessel's writings.[88] "I regard Wessel as a theodidact," said Luther; "because I have read him, my opponents imagine that Luther has taken everything from Wessel, so much do our ideas agree." [89] It appears, however, that Luther never read the works of Wessel, but relied on the reports of others as to their contents.[90]

Though Luther was not acquainted with the writings of the Gröningen professor, he knew the teachings of John Wesel, professor at Erfurt. That bold and turbulent spirit, whether as preacher or as vice-rector of the University of Erfurt, grievously scandalized the Church by the temerity of his opinions. He was censured by the tribunal of the Inquisition in 1479 for having maintained the following propositions: that Scripture is the only authority in matters of faith; that Christ conferred the right of jurisdiction over the faithful neither on the Apostles nor on their successors; that those only are saved who are predestined to grace; that Christ wishes no other prayer but the "Our Father" and requires neither festal solemnities, nor fasts, nor pilgrimages, etc. When condemned to be burned at the stake, unless he retracted these doctrines, Wesel did public penance and was confined in the Augustinian monastery at Mayence, where he died in 1481, two years before the birth of Luther.[91]

Similar doctrines were taught at Erfurt and there created a great stir, which had not yet quieted down when Luther came to that city to study.

---

[87] Döllinger, *La réforme et son développement intérieur,* III, p. 4.

[88] Hergenröther, V, p. 178.

[89] Luther, *Schriften* (Walch ed.), XIV, p. 220.

[90] Döllinger, III, p. 4.

[91] Hergenröther, V, p. 177; *Encyclopédie des sciences religieuses,* art. "Wesel."

At that same period in England, the disciples of Thomas Bradwardine (1290–1349), under the pretext of combating a pretended Pelagianism, maintained very nearly the doctrine of absolute predestination,[92] and in Switzerland Thomas Wyttenbach (1556) taught at Basle that indulgences were nothing but illusions and impostures.[93] It was not only German Lutheranism, it was also French Calvinism, English Puritanism, and Swiss Zwinglianism that was thus being worked out in some heads of that period.

Nearly all these ideas were to be found vaguely indicated or cleverly insinuated in an anonymous treatise on spirituality, probably written towards the end of the fourteenth century. This work Luther published in part in 1516, two years later in its entirety, under the title *Deutsch Theologia.* He prefixed an introduction which contained the following lines: "This excellent little book, which is so sparingly ornamented with fine words of worldly wisdom, is so much richer in the wisdom of God that I fear not to place it beside the Bible and the works of St. Augustine, for more than any other it has taught me what are God, Christ, man, and all things." In fact, the most risky speculations of the thinkers of the time were to be found therein, mingled with the most equivocal tendencies of the mystics.

Nothing could be more orthodox than the leading idea of this book, which derived not a little of its inspiration from Master Eckhart's spirituality. The author, after stating the principle that God is, if not immanent, at least present in all things, and that all activity comes from Him and should return to Him, deduces the practical conclusion that we ought to leave all things, even ourselves, in order to unite ourselves to God alone, who is to be found in the very depth of our soul.

---

[92] Wetzer and Welte *Kirchen-Lexikon,* art. "Bradwardine."

[93] *Ibid.,* arts. "Wyttenbach" and "Zwingli."

But the *Deutsch Theologia* sets forth these ideas with so much force that at times it seems to exaggerate them; it exalts the exclusive power of God so that it appears to ignore all initiative and merit on the part of man; it lays such emphasis on the value of the interior life that it appears to deny all value to external works and thereby seems to be a rough sketch of the Protestant theories of predestination and the inutility of good works.

It was in this book that Luther thought he found support for his doctrine when he published it in 1516, one year before the famous quarrel over indulgences, and provided it with an introduction which was in reality a manifesto.[94]

The artistic, literary, philosophical, and mystical movement of the Renaissance was, in fact, as capable of becoming the starting-point of the Protestant revolt, as the prelude of a Catholic reform: All depended on the spirit that prevailed in this movement and the men who directed it.[95]

---

[94] The only extant manuscript of the *Deutsch Theologia* is of the year 1494. The doctrine set forth therein is so equivocal that even to-day it is a matter of dispute between Catholics and Protestants. While Kraus vigorously defends its orthodoxy (*Histoire de l'Eglise,* II, p. 487), Kuhn (*Luther, sa vie et son œuvre*) maintains that its teaching is Protestant.

[95] The Renaissance movement was so varied, shifting, and complex, according to differences of place and time, that we can understand how historians hold such varied opinions about it. The general attitude of the Church towards it has also given rise to diverse appreciations. Baudrillart considers that "the popes joined in that movement which was then attracting and winning men's minds because the movement was inevitable and irresistible, that opposing it would not stop it, and that the very fact of papal participation proves that it was not in itself fundamentally contrary to the Christian spirit." (*Bulletin critique,* March 25th, 1902, p. 161.) Jean Guiraud, however, is "unable to share a like optimism, because it remains to be proved that this naturalism and freedom from any religious idea—qualities that finally became the distinctive traits of humanism—are not found by a sort of direct and legitimate descent, in the irreligious spirit of the eighteenth century and in the Revolution, and even in the antichristian negations of our contemporaries." (*L'Eglise romaine et les origines de la renaissance,* preface, p. xv.) Nor does it appear that the papacy had a clear and uniform attitude toward humanism. It was a humanism with Christian tendencies that the Avignon popes favored. Although an epicurean and materialist humanism triumphed at the court of Alexander VI and Leo X, yet Adrian V, Paul IV, and Pius V unmistakably withdrew from it.

PART II

THE PROTESTANT REVOLT

CHAPTER I

The Prelude in Germany

With some reason has it been said: "It was not Luther who made the new times, but rather the new times that made Luther."[1] At the beginning of the sixteenth century, not only were all Protestant ideas already fermenting in some minds, but all the social forces seemed ready to break loose in a mad frenzy. Hatred of princes for the papacy, prejudices of the legists against medieval institutions, irritation of the populace at sight of the scandals among the great, the recrudescence of paganism in art, literature, and public morals, a silent hostility against sovereign authority: these were some of the evils from which all Europe was suffering.

Characteristics of the German Renaissance

A dislocation of the German aristocracy and deep uneasiness among the lower classes rendered these dangers especially formidable in Germany. Since the death of Frederick II, the princely oligarchy, seconded by the legists, had extended its power to the injury of the authority of the emperor and of the lesser nobility. The Hohenzollerns in Brandenburg, the Wittelsbachers in the Palatinate and Bavaria, the Wettins in Saxony, and the Zähringens in Swabia clashed in rivalries that were a ceaseless cause of disturbance. "Poor Germany!" said Emperor Maximilian I (1493–1519), called "the Last of the

---

[1] Denifle and Weiss, *Luther und Luthertum,* II, p. 107.

Knights,"[2] who founded the greatness of the Austrian house but who, by a misplaced generosity, failed to defend the imperial prerogatives firmly enough against the upper nobility.[3] "We foresee a general conflagration of Germany," wrote the elector of Mayence shortly afterwards. German knighthood, dominated by the princes and ruined by the economic evolution which depreciated the value of landed property, was stirred up by a ferment of revolt. The large cities, on the contrary, were favored by commercial and industrial prosperity and sought to take the direction of political affairs into their own hands.

Peasants and workmen still received high wages;[4] but, ruined by the usury of the Jews,[5] by habits of luxury and excess in eating and drinking,[6] they were stirred by an ever growing irritation. The chronicler of Magdeburg wrote in 1402: "Between the rich and the poor there reigns an old hatred; the poor hate those who have property." During the whole century this disorder kept increasing.[7]

---

[2] The following words were found written on the wall of his bedroom at the royal castle of Innsbruck:

"I, who am king by the grace of God, wear the royal crown
In order to protect the poor,
In order to be just towards them
As well as towards the rich,
In order that we all may live together for ever
In the joy of paradise."

(Janssen, *op. cit.*, I, p. 492.)

[3] *Ibid.*, I, p. 495.

[4] "In Saxony, between 1485 and 1509, a mason or carpenter received about two big four-pfennig pieces, *i. e.*, more than a third of the value of a bushel of wheat. At Meissen, in addition to this pay, he had a right daily to two pitcherfuls of *canet* (a sort of fermented drink). In six days, reckoning only his wage, he could earn enough to buy three sheep and a pair of shoes." (Janssen, I, p. 335.)

[5] *Ibid.*, p. 371.

[6] *Ibid.*, p. 368.

[7] We cannot overemphasize the influence of economic causes on the development of Protestantism. The sudden fluctuations of wages, on account of which the workman's condition shifted from excessive luxury to extreme wretchedness, the opening of the markets of the New World, abruptly transferring the movement of commerce from the shores of the Mediterranean to those of the Atlantic, the breaking off of ties of vassalage and their replacement by unstable and precarious con-

A well regulated clergy might have been able, if not to remove evils which largely resulted from faults of the constitutions, at least to soften them by their example and labor and works. It is unfortunately true that the clergy of Germany [8] was at that time invaded by the morals and manners of secular life.[9]

Humanism was introduced into Germany by a man of genius, Nicholas of Cusa, and developed there with prodigious activity. "As in Italy," writes Baudrillart, "its disseminators were illustrious teachers, such as Alexander Hegius, whose name is associated in our memories with that of the Italian, Vittorino da Feltre. He was director, successively, of the schools of Wesel, Emmerich, and Deventer, where he had, it is said, as many as 2,200 pupils; he made the Greek and Latin classics the basis of the instruction of youth; he modified the methods of teaching, and inspired not only love of study, but even a passion for teaching in a great number of his pupils. . . . The part played by universities was much greater than that of isolated masters, and they were much more active than in Italy. . . . They were still young, but eminent men gathered around them.

"Did the Renaissance produce more astonishing results in the land of Pico della Mirandola than in the Germany of Adam Potken, who read the Aeneid and the speeches of Cicero to pupils eleven or twelve years old, or of Johann Eck, who completed the whole course of the Latin classics between his ninth

---

tractual relations, and the settling of large numbers of workmen in the big industrial cities, were conditions well calculated to give every revolt a widespread echo and to make of every new idea a ferment of anarchy. The violent deeds of the Protestants in propagating their teaching and of the Catholics in their repressive measures are ordinarily less imputable to men's personal malice than to social conditions, the responsibility for which cannot be laid at the door of any particular individual or group.

[8] If we would have an exact and genuine picture of the ecclesiastical abuses of this period, we should consult the *Hundred and One Grievances* of the German nation, presented to the Diet of Worms in 1521. (Walch, XV, p. 1636.)

[9] On the sad state of the clergy at this epoch, see Pastor, VII, ch. 7.

and twelfth years, or of Cuspinian, who delivered lectures at Vienna when he was eighteen years old, and was rector of the University at twenty-seven?"[10]

But this Germanic Renaissance soon became differentiated from the Italian Renaissance. Although like the latter it was universal in its culture, it was much more national in its aspirations. "German history, German thinking, German conscience, that is what these scholars aimed at; and if they gathered around Maximilian, it was because the Emperor was not merely a leader, but a symbol."[11] A second trait of this Renaissance was not long in taking shape: it was more scientific than literary. "Germany will have the creators of astronomy and modern geography, Johann Müller and Peutinger; she will have the princes of philology, Reuchlin and Erasmus."[12] It is especially by the latter that a third characteristic of this intellectual movement will manifest itself: it will be more concerned with religion.

The restoration of profane antiquity brought with it the restoration of sacred antiquity. Agricola studied Hebrew and translated the Psalms, Trithemius with his own hand copied a Greek version of the New Testament, Reuchlin in 1506 published his *De rudimentis hebraicis* and in 1518 his three books *De accentibus et orthographis linguae hebraicae*. Erasmus, in 1505, gave the public a commentary on the New Testament according to Valla's edition, and in 1516 the Graeco-Latin edition of the Gospels, the Acts, and the Epistles. His motto, "To preach Christ according to the sources" *(Christum ex fontibus praedicare)*, became that of most of the literary men and even gained favor among the people. From 1477 to 1518, according to Janssen, there were not less than 19 editions of the Scriptures, 25 of the Gospels or Epistles, 11 of the Psalms. Upon entering the northern countries, humanism assumed a graver and more disturbing aspect. This "new culture," which for the light-minded Italian was only voluptuousness, for the sneering Frenchman only a pretext for spiritual jesting, in the head of a dreamy, mystical German, prejudiced against Rome, took the form of an obsesssion and became real fanaticism.

---

[10] Baudrillart, *The Catholic Church, the Renaissance, and Protestantism*, p. 33. "At Cologne there were Bartholomaeus of Cologne and Ortwin Gratius; at Heidelberg, Rodolphus Agricola, the chancellor Johann von Dalberg, Reuchlin, the illustrious abbot of Sponheim, Johann Trithemus, the greatest German historian of the century; at Erfurt, the famous group of humanists founded by Maternus Pistorius, with Crotus Rubeanus, Eobanus Hessus, Hermann Busch, Mutian—the poets who soon opposed the Scholastics; at Basle, Heynlin von Stein, who still adhered to the Scholastic school and represented it with honor; finally at Strasbourg, Wimpheling, in whom ardent patriotism was joined with extensive learning, dictated the first history of Germany written by a humanist."

[11] Imbart de la Tour, II, p. 341.

[12] *Ibid.*, p. 542.

In studying the religion of Christ at its sources, profound differences (if not dogmatic, at least moral) were thought to be discovered between the religion of the Apostles and the Fathers of the Church on one hand, and the religion professed by the entourage of Innocent VIII, Alexander VI, Julius II, and Leo X on the other. Still more was the difference noted between pagan antiquity and Christian dogmas: in the former all the natural tendencies of man are exalted; in the latter nothing is more strongly marked than the fall. Is this nature, to which the Renaissance sought to lead us back, fundamentally good or bad? And must not this anxious query extend to the Author of the world Himself? When the question of indulgences comes to the fore, a German will be unable to keep from crying out: "What a trifling question this is which discusses how far the power of the Church extends in the matter of indulgences, beside that other question, so much more serious, to know how far extend the power and goodness of Him who has given the Church its authority." Thus the most fundamental religious tenets came to be questioned.

These problems tormented the German humanists so much the more as Erasmus,[13] the protagonist of the intellectual movement, while no doubt sincerely [14] keeping from making war on the Church, was, none the less, a religious who left his monastery and discarded all the rules of his Order, a priest never saying mass and rarely hearing it, a Christian preaching the primitive austerity of Christianity and seeming to live like a pagan. In fact, did he not proclaim that "there were more saints than we have in our catalogue," [15] and that the force of moral instinct was able to raise the pagans to a loftiness of spiritual nobility never surpassed by Christian holiness?[16] Such being his dispositions, we are not surprised that Erasmus took little account of dogmatic formulas, that he uttered many diatribes against Scholasticism and the Middle Ages, and that he spoke with the greatest contempt of the literal sense of Scripture.

---

[13] Didier of Rotterdam, who, following a common practice among the humanists, translated his name into Greek (Desiderius, 'Εράσμιος, *i.e.,* the amiable), was born October 28, 1467, under most untoward circumstances, *"ex illicito et, ut timet, incestuoso concubitu,"* says a memoir of Leo X (January 25th, 1517), quoted by Janssen (II, p. 6). The great historian of the German Reformation says: "Erasmus was an orphan from early childhood and was robbed of his inheritance by avaricious tutors. He embraced the monastic life without having any real vocation among the Augustinians of Stein, not far from Gonda. Thenceforth he never ceased nourishing a deep hatred for the religious vows as approved by the Church. In 1491 he left his monastery and for ten years he led a disturbed and wandering life in continual journeyings through Europe, thinking of settling down in England or in France or even in Italy, or at other times in the Netherlands or Burgundy and even speaking of ending his days in Spain or Poland. Although he was a priest, he soon incurred the reproach of almost never saying mass and rarely hearing it. The 'most learned Erasmus' considered ridiculous the Breviary prayers and the Church laws of fasting and abstinence. In the matter of his moral conduct, he used to utter the most kindly judgments. Love of money was unknown to him; drunkenness and debauchery were repugnant to his nature. (*Opera,* III, 1527–1530, *App. epist.,* July 8th and 9th, 1514.) His frail constitution forbade all excess. Yet it has been thought that his taste for heavy wines was a cause of certain pains that often distressed him. He exercised an immense influence on his age. We are amazed at the enumeration of his varied and incessant labors. His wealth of style has been rarely equalled. His penetrating glance embraced everything." (Janssen, II, pp. 6–10.) When Luther was placed under the ban of the empire, Erasmus regretted what he had written in praise of the apostate friar, and he would not yield to the solicitations of Melanchthon, Zwingli, and Hutten, who tried to draw him to their side. At the same time he refused Leo X, Adrian VI, and Clement VII to undertake a campaign against the heresiarch. Pope Paul III wished to make him a cardinal, but he declined. He died (July 12th, 1536) with these words on his lips: *"Domine, miserere mei."*

[14] Plancke, *Le catholicisme d'Erasme,* in the *Revue Pratique d'Apologétique,* December 5th, 1908, p. 419.

[15] Erasmus, *Colloquia,* I, p. 182 (*Convivium religiosum*).

This is the man the German Renaissance acclaimed as a demigod. When, during his peregrinations, Erasmus deigned to stop at Erfurt, Konrad Mutianus greeted him in these terms: "In Erasmus the limit of human talents is surpassed; Erasmus is a divine being. Let us adore him with religious piety." [17]

It is true that the author of *The Praise of Folly* had sincere returns to orthodoxy. He feared that the Renaissance would bring about a return to paganism. That apprehension haunted and disturbed him.[18] He wished to maintain amicable relations with Rome, dedicated his New Testament to the Pope, and gloried in the Brief of felicitation which the Pontiff sent him.[19] From no one did Protestantism receive more bitter criticisms than those directed against it by this scholar in whom the spirit of his age was incarnated.

The drama of anguish and rebellion which was about to agitate Europe was first enacted in the troubled and passionate soul of a friar, Martin Luther.

Luther the Student

"I am the son of peasants," wrote Luther; "my father, my grandfather, my ancestors were real peasants [20] . . . My parents were very poor, and my mother, to bring us up, often carried wood on her back." [21]

---

[16] *"Quotusquisque Christianorum sic moderatur viam suam? Quid ab homine christiano divi potuit melius?"* (*Ibid.*) On this subject, see Dedieu, *Les origines de la morale indépendante* in *La Revue Pratique d'Apologétique*, June 15th, 1909.

[17] Janssen, II, p. 22.

[18] *Opera*, III, p. 189.

[19] Letter of Leo X to Erasmus, September 10th, 1515. Erasmus, *Opera*, III, p. 156; Brief of September 16th, 1518.

[20] *"Ego sum rustici filius, proavus, avus meus, pater sein rechte pauren gewest."* (Bindseil, *Martini Lutheri colloquia*, II, p. 153.)

Martin Luther was born November 10th, 1483, at Eisleben in Saxony, of the peasant Hans Luder [22] and Margaret Ziegler, his wife. The Saxon peasant, better paid at that time than he is today,[23] was, nevertheless, in consequence of habits of luxury or of excess in eating and drinking, often in a precarious situation.[24] It has been conjectured that Martin Luther's almost irresistible fondness for wine and good cheer, which he often avowed, came to him by heredity. Hans Luder was stern and irascible, as also was his wife. Luther himself says: "One day my father beat me so mercilessly that I was frightened and ran away from home. I was so embittered against him that he had to win me to himself again. And once my mother, on account of an insignificant nut, beat me till the blood flowed." [25]

Hans Luder settled at Eisleben because he had to flee from Mohra, his native place in Thuringia, where, it was said, he had, in a fit of anger, killed a herdsman who was working for him.[26] At least it is affirmed that the Luder family was not liked by the people of Eisleben. "God has placed me in such a position," said Luther, "that at times I have to hum a little refrain which my mother used to sing:

No one loves us, nor thee nor me.
If not our own, whose fault can it be?" [27]

---

[21] *"Pater ist ein armer heuer gewest, die mutter hat alle ihr holtz auff dem ruhken eingetragen, damit sie uns ertzogen hat."* (*Coll.*, II, p. 160.)

[22] Luther signed himself "Luder," which was his father's name, until 1517, at which time he dropped "Luder," which means "carrion," for "Luther," which, he said, came from Lothair or Lauter.

[23] This is the conclusion reached by Janssen in a close study which he made of the German peasant of the fifteenth century. Janssen, I, p. 335.

[24] *Ibid.*, p. 368.

[25] Luther, *Tischreden.*

[26] Janssen, II, p. 67.

[27] *"Mir und Dir Niemand hold.*
Das ist beider Schuld."
(*Ibid.*, II, p. 67; Kuhn, I, p. 22; *Sämmtliche Werke,* LXIII, p. 332.)

Margaret Ziegler was genuinely pious, but her piety was timorous and troubled; she had a great fear of the devil.[28] In the Luder household, not only did they have a terror of the devil, they also trembled before Christ. As Luther himself says: "We grew pale at the mere name of Christ, for He was represented to us as a terrible and angry judge." [29]

When the boy reached the age of fourteen, his father entrusted him to the Brethren of the Common Life at Magdeburg, where they had a Latin school. The historians of the Founder of the Protestant Revolt relate of him (some to increase his glory, others to lessen his fame) that as a student young Martin Luder went begging for alms.[30]

We do not know what circumstances led young Martin during his sixteenth year from the Magdeburg school to that of Eisenach. In the latter he doubtless found the same régime of studies and distractions. At this time, when his eager youth sought only to spend itself, he became acquainted with the two passions which humanism was everywhere stirring up in men's souls: the passion of esthetic pleasure and that of glory.

---

[28] Luther relates that his mother was for a long time tormented by the diabolical enchantments of a neighbor, a sort of sorceress, who had to be placated by presents. (*Colloquia,* III, p. 9.)

[29] *Ibid.*

[30] "Do not despise," he said at a later time, "poor students who go about singing and begging a little bread for the love of God. I was one of them. I begged from door to door." But this incident should be reduced to its true proportions. Singing in the streets and receiving a coin from some passerby was not unusual for a German student of that period. "When two or three persons are together," says a book published in 1509 (quoted by Janssen, I, p. 219), "they have to sing." Drinking songs and religious canticles, songs of romantic sentiment and satirical compositions echoed through the streets and at cross-roads. Young Luder, whose pleasing voice had an agreeable and sonorous *timbre,* must have taken a considerable part in these artistic distractions. And, besides, he always kept a tender memory of the religious songs which he either sang or heard in his youth. In one of his sermons he said: "The papists composed some very fine hymns, as, for instance, 'O thou who rent the gates of hell' and 'Christ is risen.'" These hymns seem verily to spring from the heart. At Christmas was sung, "A little Child to us is born"; at Pentecost, "Let us pray the Holy Ghost"; and during mass you might hear the beautiful hymn, "Blessed be Thou, most holy God, who nourishest us with Thy own substance." Janssen (*An meine Kritiker,* p. 61) proves that half of the hymns for which Luther has been credited, go back to an earlier time and were simply altered by him to make them agree with his new doctrine. But religious songs were not the only ones heard on the streets of Magdeburg. The young student must have heard, and very likely joined in, drinking songs such as these: "Long life to wine, to the wine of the Rhine. The timid it makes bold, and the miser it makes liberal."—"What I love is bound, bound by hoops of iron; what I love wears a dress, a dress of wood; what I love is wine, Rhine wine, in its cask." (Cf. Janssen, I, pp. 215, 222.)

Ursula Cotta, a noble lady of Italian birth, having heard the young student sing in church, was unable to conceal her emotion; she sent for him, introduced him into her home, admitted him to her table, showered him with presents, and altered his needy existence into an almost luxurious life. Later on the poor apostate friar sadly recalled that Ursula Cotta had taught him to sing this refrain, which may have troubled him in his monastic cell:

> "There's naught on earth sweeter than a woman's love, if one is privileged to obtain it." [31]

It was likewise at Eisenach, according to Luther's declaration, that he heard one of his teachers predict a great destiny for him.[32] This prophet may have been John Trebonius, who was accustomed to take off his hat when entering his class and respectfully advance to his desk with uncovered head. "Among these young men," he said, "there are some whom God one day will make judges, burgomasters, and doctors; it is but right to show them, even now, the respect due to their noble destiny."

In the autumn of 1501, at the age of eighteen, Luther passed to the University of Erfurt, where he took up the study of law and philosophy.

---

[31] *"Nichts lieberes ist auf Erden,*
Denn Frauen Lieb, wem sie mag zu Theil werden."
Such is the original text which Protestant historians have sometimes tried to soften. (Cf. Janssen, II, p. 68.) Luther quotes it in his commentary on the Book of Proverbs (xxxi, 11). No one has ever claimed that Ursula Cotta was a loose character or that Luther was lacking in delicacy. Yet the title of "worthy matron," which some historians give her on that occasion, seems exaggerated. Janssen remarks that more than forty years later one of her sons was a student at Wittenberg. She could not have been very old in 1500.

[32] Köstlin, quoted by Janssen, *l.c.*

We know that these studies in certain schools at the beginning of the sixteenth century had become a set of dry metaphysical formulas, mixed with daring propositions. The eager young man, however, passionately devoted himself to them. Subtle, tenacious in discussion, powerful in his attacks, he vexed with his arguments his fellow-students and even his professor, the honest Jodocus Truttvetter, whose death Luther later on accused himself of having perhaps hastened.[33]

But such exercises did not absorb his tireless activity. We know that he successfully followed Jerome Emser's course of humanities and, according to Melanchthon, "the whole school admired his remarkable gifts of mind." [34] His favorite authors were Cicero, Livy, Virgil, and Plautus. He ardently devoted himself to music and often took part in the recreations of his companions. "He was," says Mathesius, "a young man of good and cheerful nature, given to liberal studies and to music, which he liked throughout his life." [35] Nowhere in Germany perhaps was humanism more brilliantly developed than at Erfurt. By the side of Konrad Mutianus, canon of Gotha, whom his enthusiastic pupils called "the Master of Virtue," and "the Father of Blessed Peace," was John Lange, the learned Hellenist, who remained a close friend of the reformer, George Spalatin, who was destined to play a still greater part in Luther's life, and Ulrich von Hutten, whom we shall presently see stirring up the celebrated "quarrel of the monks" and the no less celebrated "war of the knights."

---

[33] In a letter to Spalatin, he says: *"Timeo ansam acceleratae suae mortis fuisse."* Denifle, one of the latest historians of Luther, in his *Luther und Luthertum* (Italian translation, p. 200), remarks that Luther was a scholastic disputant of the first class and that he used all the classical procedures, with this sole difference, that he employed them, not to reach clearer and more precise conclusions, but to create confusion.

[34] Melanchthon, *Vita Lutheri,* in the *Corpus reformatorum,* VI, p. 157.

[35] Janssen, II, p. 69.

If the city of Erfurt had its Politian in Mutianus, it also possessed a Poggio in Bebel, whose *Facetiae*, published in 1506, were no less obscene or less indicative of profound corruption than those of the famous Italian humanist.[36]

These invitations to a sensual and luxurious life found a strange contrast in painting, sculpture, and engraving. The close of the fifteenth century was marked by the appearance in art of a new theme, which the brush and the chisel would execute under every form: the *danse macabre*. Grinning corpses, living beings surprised and pitilessly dragged along by mocking death, infernal dances in which the grotesque was mixed with the terrible, such were the subjects which Holbein, Dürer, and many others loved.[37] Luther saw them and was annoyed by them. The frightful impressions of early childhood suddenly returned to his mind and terrified him. Often at the close of a merry party, or in the midst of a noisy festival, his face became serious: the thought of divine justice and the fear of the devil had seized him. In such a state of mind, the smallest events could have most serious consequences. One day, at the Erfurt library, where Luther loved to spend long hours, he saw for the first time one of those Latin Bibles which were being multiplied by the invention of printing. The city of Erfurt had procured it at a great price. He opened it, turned over its pages, and admired it.[38] "My God," he exclaimed, "how I would long to have such a book as this above all things else!" He began to peruse the Old and the New Testament in this magnificent edition. A great change took place within him. "Lord," he cried, "how small my illustrious master Jodocus Truttvetter appears to me when I compare him with Moses and St. Paul."

---

[36] *Ibid.*, pp. 28, 31.

[37] We may well wonder what was the reason for the appearance of the *"danse macabre"* in the art of the fifteenth century. It would seem that this systematic representation of death was due to the influence of the preaching friars, who sought to stir up a reaction against worldly vanity by frequent appeals to man's last end. Moreover, these representations, coming from the Renaissance artists, did not convey that mild and serene impression which medieval artists gave to their death scenes. The new art accustomed painters to represent bodies, not souls. Hence, under their brushes we have more voluptuousness in living beings and more horror in dead. Cf. Male, *"La danse macabre"* in the *Revue des Deux Mondes,* April 1st, 1906.

[38] *Colloquia,* III, p. 271.

When Luther was twenty years old, excessive application to study had exhausted him and he fell ill. His weakness served to increase his nervous excitability. It does not appear that any priest exercised a spiritual influence upon him at this time. During his sickness he seems to have been visited only by an aged monk, whose name has not come down to us.[39]

Three incidents, of small importance in themselves, produced a decisive reaction on this sickly nature. One day, while on a visit to his parents, he happened to become entangled with his sword.[40] He became frightened and, thinking he was going to die, cried out: "Mary, help me!" Later he declared that the Blessed Virgin had saved him. This incident, which took place in 1503, increased his impressionableness. Though he led a pure life, he was sometimes seized with mortal dread and trembled at the thought of God's judgments. "Often," says Melanchthon, "when he reflected on the anger and judgment of God, a violent terror seized him which almost brought on his death. I myself have seen him, when speaking about some doctrinal matter, rush to an adjoining room, cast himself on the bed, and repeatedly cry out: 'He [God] has subjected all to damnation in order to have pity on all.' "[41]

In 1505 two additional events took place which exercised a more decisive influence on the orientation of his life. One of his friends met a sudden death in a duel. This catastrophe shook Luther's soul to its very depth. A short time afterwards, while still under the impression of this shock, he was overtaken by a storm at the gates of Erfurt: a bolt of lightning struck close beside him. The terrified young man cried out: "Saint Ann, save me and I will become a monk!" That was on July 2nd, 1505. Luther often recalled this critical date.[42]

---

[39] *Studien und Kritiken*, 1871, p. 41.

[40] Students habitually wore a sword with hangings at that time.

[41] Melanchthon, *Vita Lutheri*, in *Corpus reformatorum*, VI, p. 7.

For fourteen years he remained undecided, then at last resolved to seek admission to the Order of the Augustinians.

On July 16th he invited his comrades to a banquet. There was music, and the party lasted far into the night; it was only at early dawn that Luther confided his project to his friends. Let us report the event in Luther's own words. "God had translated my vow into Hebrew, for 'Ann' means 'grace,' not 'law.' I persevered, then, and, on the vigil of St. Alexis, invited some of my best friends for the purpose of bidding them farewell and to escort me to the monastery in the morning. As they kept begging me to give up my purpose, I said to them: 'Today you still see me, but you will never see me again.' Then, with tears in their eyes, they accompanied me. My father was greatly irritated over my vow, but I persevered in my plan. I intended never to come forth from the monastery, regarding myself as dead to the world." [43] That morning, July 17th, the feast of St. Alexis, Martin Luther presented himself at the monastery of the Augustinians. He brought with him his ring, denoting his rank of magister, his Plautus, and his Virgil, all carefully wrapped up. The next day he sent the ring back to the university, but kept the Virgil and Plautus.

Would monastic discipline subdue this ardent soul, which so many causes, both internal and external, had contributed to exasperate? Would he find peace by taking the religious habit, by receiving holy orders, by being subjected to a firm and prudent spiritual direction? As a primary condition for that, it was needful that the monastic rule should appeal to him with an authority capable of subduing him;[44] it was also necessary that the rule should find in him who accepted it a humble soul open to its salutary action.

---

[42] It has been thought that Luther sought spiritual counsel at this critical period of his life. A manuscript quoted by Kuhn (*Luther, sa vie et son œuvre,* I, p. 44) reports that he consulted his preceptor and some matrons on his vocation. But it has been proved that the reported fact does not belong to his life at all, but is borrowed verbatim from the life of his disciple Myconius.

[43] *Colloquia,* III, p. 187.

Luther as a Monk

Martin Luther entered the monastery in a fit of despair, "not so much attracted as driven" (*non tam tractus quam raptus*), as he himself says. And the bitter and incessant reproaches of his father and mother were not calculated to calm his disturbed soul. "My son," his father wrote to him, "you have offended against the fourth commandment in refusing us all comfort and help after all the sacrifices we have made for you."[45] The reception of the habit brought him only a momentary joy, which was soon followed by mortal anguish; the silence of his cell served but to develop in him a sad bitterness. He himself tells us the cause: "At that time I was the most presumptuous of the just:[46] relying on my works, I trusted not in God, but in my own justice. I presumed to scale heaven."[47] God does not condescend to so haughty a soul.

The unhappy man continued to seek peace in external works of mortification. "I became," he says, "the persecutor and horrible executioner of my own life: I fasted, I endured vigils, I wore myself out in prayer, to do which is nothing but suicide." [48]

---

[44] It is difficult to pass a general judgment on the state of monastic morals in Germany at the beginning of the sixteenth century. Beside praiseworthy examples of monastic life, we meet lamentable scandals. It is certain that the monasteries of the Augustinian Order, which went over to Protestantism *en masse*, had fallen very low indeed. See Denifle, *Luther and Lutherdom*, p. 360; Pastor, VII, p. 303.

[45] Janssen, II, p. 70.

[46] Or rather "of those seeking justification" (*praesumptuosissimus justitiarius*). *Ibid.*

[47] Kuhn, I, p. 55.

At times, in fits of despair, he took to hating God and cursing Christ. "I was so estranged from Christ," he declares, "that when I saw any of His images, such as the crucifix, I was at once seized with fright; I would more willingly have looked upon the devil." [49]

His approaching ordination to the priesthood in 1507 brought him a gleam of hope. In a letter to his friend John Braun, assistant pastor of Eisenach, inviting him to come to his first mass, he says: "God, glorious and holy in all His works, has deigned to exalt me, wretched and unworthy sinner that I am, and to call me to His sublime ministry, only for His mercy's sake. I ought to be thankful for the glory of such divine goodness (as much as dust may be) and to fulfill the duty laid upon me . . . Help me with your gracious presence and prayers, that my sacrifice may be acceptable in God's sight." [50] The ordination ceremony awakened terrible anxieties in the soul of the new priest. At the offertory, while saying, *"Suscipe, sancte Pater, omnipotens, aeterne Deus, hanc immaculatam hostiam, quam ego indignus famulus tuus,"* he tried to leave the altar. His prior restrained him.[51] "Alas," he said, "how can I dare to address God, when men tremble before a king?" At the words of the ordaining bishop, *"Accipe potestatem sacrificandi pro vivis et mortuis,"* he was seized by a sudden trembling; "if at that moment the earth did not swallow me," he said later, "it was at fault."

---

[48] Janssen, II, p. 71. Later on, Luther complained that he had been a victim of the fasts and vigils of the monastic life. Denifle (p. 347) shows, by a minute examination of the monastery rule and by avowals of Luther himself, that the rule was very mild. Christiani (*Luther et le Luthéranisme*, pp. 54–58) sums up Denifle's argument.

[49] Janssen, I, p. 72.

[50] De Wette, I, p. 3; Smith, *Luther's Correspondence*, I, p. 21.

[51] *"Incipiens verba canonis, ita horrui ut fugissem de altari nisi fuissem admonitus per priorem."* (*Colloquia*, III, p. 169.)

He seems to have grown calmer after his first mass. At a meal at which the young priest's relatives and friends were gathered, Hans Luder arose and gravely said: "My son, know you not that you must honor your father?" [52] Then, after a short pause: "Son, you have forsaken your mother and me." The young priest was greatly moved and muttered his excuses, alleging miraculous occurrences, his friend's death, the flash of lightning, etc. But the old peasant replied: "God grant that it may not have been a delusion or a diabolical deception!" Luther, when recounting this incident, added: "It was impossible for me to turn back; my heart was established in piety. Yet I could not despise my father's words." [53]

Thus the monastic rule and the priesthood, far from quieting Luther, only aggravated his distress.[54]

In 1507 the Augustinians elected as their superior general a man whose lofty culture, breadth of view, and personal eminence were calculated to attract the sympathies of the young friar and hold him by ties of remarkable affection. This man was Johann von Staupitz. He was an imposing personage, descended from a noble Saxon family. "He shone not only in the class-room and in church," said Luther, "but held his place in the world among the great ones of the court." [55] Staupitz henceforth became the regular director of the young Augustinian's conscience and studies.[56]

---

[52] *Ibid.*, p. 156. *"Die primitiarum mearum, objiciebat mihi: Fili, nescis, quod patrem honorare debuisti?"*

[53] Kuhn, I, p. 56.

[54] What was the nature of Luther's torments? Some historians have thought he was epileptic or hypochondriac; others maintain that he was possessed by the devil. In support of these opinions, there is cited a fact which Cochlaeus reports: "One day at mass, while the priest was reading the gospel of the demoniac, Luther fell prostrate, as though thrown down by some invisible force; he cried out: '*Non sum! non sum!*'" (Kuhn, I, p. 55). It seems that his moral trouble was accompanied by some nervous malady.

[55] Kuhn, I, p. 62.

Johann von Staupitz, the type of a distinguished gentleman and perfect humanist, was a pious and scholarly priest, with a mind open to all new ideas. But in character he was weak, hesitating, lacking foresight as well as firmness, a man but little suited to guide the sickly and tormented soul of Brother Martin.[57] We shall later see him uphold Luther and abandon him in turn, bow before Tetzel and banter him in secret, carry on a friendly correspondence with Cajetan and combat him. This trait led the reformer to say. "He is unable to decide between the pope and Christ!" [58]

It was under this master's guidance, from 1507 to 1517, that the restless Luther, brooding over his personal anguish, feeding his mind daily with books in which decadent Scholasticism mingled a rash and novel idea with the dryness of its dialectics, devouring the writings into which Pierre d'Ailly, Jean Gerson, and the disciples of Master Eckhart injected more than one equivocal formula,[59] breathing at Erfurt an atmosphere in which the Brethren of the Free Spirit and certain scholars—Berthold, Wessel, and Wesel—had spread many venturesome ideas, gradually elaborated the three fundamental dogmas that were to constitute his own particular doctrine, later known as Lutheranism.[60] These dogmas were: (1)

---

[56] It does not appear that, up to this period of his life, Luther had a confidant to guide or advise him. The preceptor, who restrained him when he was on the point of leaving the altar during his ordination, was merely one of those tutors who helped the students in preparing their lessons. When, in 1505, Luther alludes to his confessions, he never speaks of a particular confessor. He simply says: "our confessors." "We wearied our confessors, and they scared us with their conditional absolutions." (*Colloquia,* I, p. 69.)

[57] On entering religion. Luther took the name Augustine. Later on he dropped it, saying that it was offensive to him to seem to deny his baptism by repudiating the name received therein.

[58] *"Inter papam et Christum medius haeret."* (Luther, *Epist.,* I, p. 211.)

[59] It is claimed that Luther knew by heart Biel's scholastic manual and the chief works of Pierre d'Ailly.

[60] In the opinion of Harnack and other liberal Protestants, which is shared by

the psychological doctrine of the absolute corruption of human nature and the denial of free will; (2) the soteriological doctrine of man's redemption by Christ alone to the exclusion of all coöperation by our good works; and (3) the ecclesiological doctrine of the rejection of papal authority and the substitution for it of the exclusive authority of Scripture, individually interpreted. Luther drew these pretended dogmas from his personal experience and borrowed the formulas into which he cast them from the authors he had before his eyes.

The violent and exaggerated state of soul which inspired the thoughts and feelings of the Augustinian friar and which, by the phenomenon known as "substitution of feelings," so much studied by modern psychologists, soon carried him to opposite extremes, may be characterized in three words: Pelagianism, Pharisaism, and Papism. A Pelagian he certainly was, since, as we have seen above, he wanted "to scale heaven" by his own powers. By his absolute confidence in the efficacy of good works, he deserves to be called a Pharisee. He himself later on said with much irreverence, but not without a certain appositeness: "If ever a monk entered heaven by his monkery, surely I would have done so." When he became a priest, "he would have liked all his relatives to be dead so that he might free them from Purgatory by his masses." This Pelagianism and Pharisaism were strengthened by an immoderate devotion to the authority of the pope and of tradition. "At that period," he said later on, "I would have slain, if I could, all who refused to obey the pope, were it only in the matter of a syllable."[61]

Denifle, Luther did not seek to establish a Protestant church until the Diet of Worms (1521), at which time he found himself at the head of a vast movement and, alarmed at his own work, tried to restrain it. It was then that Melanchthon's support proved useful to him and led him to give the sanction of his authority to the Protestant doctrines of the Augsburg Confession. From that time Protestanism took the place of Lutheranism.

[61] *Sämmtliche Werke,* XL, p. 184.

"No one reverenced the traditions of the Fathers more than I did; I regarded them as holiness itself." [62]

But it happened that, despite the friar's ardent will to save himself through himself, despite the impetuosity of his zeal for the Church and the pope, the expected conversion did not take place: his rebellious human nature kept torturing him, his scruples did not cease, the flesh cried out unceasingly, the disquiet increased. His proud obstinacy blinded him: how indestructible must be his defects, he thought, since the most tenacious will was unable to correct them. How thoroughly human nature must be vitiated in the very depth of its substance and in its free will. And how inefficacious must be man's effort to attain salvation, since the most perfect works, those of the monastic life, were unable to do it. If there is any redemption and justification for man, it can come only from the work of Christ. And doubtless the most complete adherence to the hierarchy was no safeguard, since a zeal like Luther's for the pope and the Fathers did not save him. From this soul, so full of distress, there thus arose the three dogmas of original corruption of human nature, the inefficacy of good works, and ecclesiastical anarchy, not formulated in precise terms nor fully conscious, but silently inspiring in him, first discouragement and then revolt.

---

[62] These words remind us of those which Lamennais wrote in the *Avenir,* addressed to the then pope: "Father, read the hearts of your children. If a single one of their thoughts be estranged from yours, they disavow and abjure it." In the description of the state of Luther's soul, following Döllinger, Janssen, and Pastor, we have frequently supported our view by the very declarations of Luther himself. The view recently expressed by Denifle, that the history of Luther before the quarrel over indulgences is impossible to write because it rests solely on his own testimony, seems excessive. The errors and misstatements so patiently brought to light by Denifle in Luther's writings, however incontestable they may be, are not sufficient to call his testimony in question when it agrees with facts otherwise known, when it fits the person's character, when it explains his later life and his teaching, and when it manifestly breathes an accent of sincerity. It is solely under these conditions that we have considered we could safely appeal to Luther's own words in our narrative.

The good and faint-hearted Staupitz, witnessing this sad crisis, felt pity for the poor harassed friar. Unfortunately this man, more humanist than theologian,[63] more orator than psychologist, did not always measure the import of his words of consolation and did not calculate the effect which the strong maxims of his master, St. Augustine, might have in the vibrating soul of the young priest. One day Luther, in a fit of despair, said to him: "Father, how terrible God seems to me! Why has He so deeply wounded the heart of man?" Staupitz replied: "He has wounded man in order to heal him; He has let him be lost in order to save him." Luther concluded that man's free will was destroyed by the all-powerful will of God. "Another day," Luther relates, "I wrote to Doctor Staupitz: 'Oh, my sins, my sins!' He answered: 'Christ is the true pardon of true sinners.' "[64] And belief in salvation by Christ alone took root in his soul.

His faith in tradition and in the pope persisted for a long time. Janssen has shown that it is not exact to say that Luther's journey to Rome in 1511 destroyed this faith. Even amidst the luxury of the Roman court, the Augustinian friar deeply venerated the pope and the Church; his correspondence bears witness to this fact.[65] It was the imprudence of Staupitz that finally ruined that belief.

One day Luther found the works of John Hus in the library of the Erfurt monastery. As he read them, he could not restrain a deep sympathy for that bold reformer, whom Rome had condemned. This thought preoccupied him. But one day Staupitz, while showing him, in the portrait gallery of the superiors of the Augustinian Order, the picture of one of his predecessors, Zachary by name, said to him: "You see this friar: he must be in hell unless he repented; for he was one of those who, at the Council of Constance, condemned John Hus by a false interpretation of the Bible." Such words helped to lessen in Luther's eyes the prestige with which, until then, he had always surrounded the authority of a council condemning a heretic.

---

[63] A. Jundt, *Le développement de la pensée religieuse de Luther jusqu'en 1517*, p. 54.

[64] Luther, *Schriften* (Walch ed.), XXII, p. 553.

[65] Janssen, II, p. 73.

The evil was completed by the reading and study which the imprudent superior allowed to the puffed-up friar. The books which Luther studied at the Erfurt monastery, and those which he consulted later for his teaching at Wittenberg, did not suggest to him his new dogmas, as has often been said,[66] but they furnished the innovator with certain expressions which he was glad to make use of. Therein he encountered the triple influence of Augustinianism, mysticism, and Nominalism.

In the works of St. Augustine, so much esteemed in the monasteries placed under the patronage of that holy Doctor, Luther eagerly annotated the passages where the master, in refuting Pelagianism, belittled human reason and combated the arrogance of the human will. *"Pulchre pulchra,"* he wrote in the margin, *"Egregie solvis, sancte Pater Augustine."* At the end of the treatise *De vera religione* he added these words: *"Totam philosophiam stultitiam esse. Intellige, quod legis."* He thought he discovered in the *Confessions* of St. Augustine the doctrine that the soul attains to God by piety alone, as opposed to theology.[67]

In the writings of the mystics, which he read greedily,[68] in the *Deutsch Theologia,* and in the works of Master Eckhart's disciples, he observed—so he thought—a contempt for external works, and faith in Christ as the sole Redeemer. From these mystics he took only the theories which seemed to him to agree with his personal aspirations and his own experience.[69]

---

[66] Jundt (*op. cit.*), it seems to us, insists too much on these intellectual influences.

[67] In 1893 Buchwald published Luther's marginal notes, written in St. Augustine's works. Cf. Jundt, pp. 76, 78. The annotations on Peter Lombard, which Luther made about 1511, when he was delivering his commentary on the *Sentences,* express the same sentiments. (Jundt, p. 101.)

[68] Denifle demonstrates that Luther did not make a deep study of the mystics. But he did consult them and often turned the pages of their books.

In the works of the Nominalists of Occam's school he read that words are only "vain sounds devoid of meaning" (*flatus vocis*), that life is to be found only in Christ and sacred Scripture, that the authority of the sovereign pontiff must yield to that of secular rulers. These words supplied Luther with most precious formulas, which he employed against the pope and against tradition.[70]

---

[69] That Luther took from the authors that he read only such ideas as were conformable to his personal experience is admitted by the principal Protestant historians. One of the most remarkable examples of this fact is found in the Lutheran theory of redemption. We know the primitive redemption theory set forth by St. Irenaeus, drawn from the customs of ancient slavery. It explained that Christ paid the devil the ransom of man, Satan's slave. In the twelfth century this was replaced by two other theories. These were St. Anselm's juridical theory, known as the theory of vicarious substitution, connected with the Augustinian tradition, and Abélard's moral and psychological theory, which was rather akin to Pelagianism. According to St. Anselm, redemption consists in the fact that Christ substituted himself for the sinner in order to make reparation for the offense committed against God; thus the Redeemer wiped out in man both the sin and its stain. According to Abélard, redemption takes place essentially in man's heart by a conversion, for which Christ's life and death are both the means and the moving influence. In the thirteenth century St. Thomas moderated and completed the Anselmian theory of vicarious substitution by the idea of a mystical solidarity between Christ and man. In the next century, the mystical French school of Pierre d'Ailly and John Gerson subjected Abélard's theory to a certain correction. Like Abélard, they started out from the psychological point of view, but they did not extend the perspective all the way to God. While the need of conversion by reparation exists in man's heart, says d'Ailly, it is also required in the bosom of God by infinite justice and mercy; in a sort of dramatic prosopeia, he shows absolute justice accusing man, while infinite mercy intercedes for him. The great discussion resulted in the decree of the Incarnation and death of Christ the Redeemer. Luther was familiar with the works of Pierre d'Ailly. Why did he reject this theory, from which Zwingli drew his inspiration, and prefer that of external and juridical redemption with its extrinsic quality? Once more we find Luther adopting—at least until the Augsburg Confession—a religious theory merely to explain his own personal psychology. For this monk, who found himself powerless to repress concupiscence, man is incapable of conversion, unable to obtain pardon. Christ the Redeemer merely casts the mantle of His justice over the sinner's leprosy; but no internal change takes place in the soul. In St. Augustine he found, in regard to the effect of Baptism on concupiscence, certain rather dangerous expressions when literally interpreted, *e. g.*, "Concupiscence is remitted, indeed, in baptism, not that it may be put out of existence, but that it may not be imputed for sin." (St. Augustine, *Works*, XII, p. 126, *i. e.*, *On Marriage and Concupiscence*, bk. 1, chap. 28; *P.L.*, XLIV, col. 429. Cf. *P.L.* XLIX, col. 173, 178.) According to St. Augustine, original sin consists in concupiscence.

The friar reformer preached his new doctrine openly under the kindly eyes of his master, Staupitz. In a sermon delivered on Christmas, 1515, he said: "Our justice is nothing but sin: let each one confine himself to accepting the grace which is offered him by Christ." [71] On April 7th, 1516, he wrote to his friend, the friar Spenlein: "Let us learn to say, 'Thou, Lord, art my righteousness, and I am Thy sin.' " And he adds: "He who does not believe this, is damned." [72] In August, 1517, he taught that "the human will is not free, but captive." [73]

In a sermon delivered about this time, commenting on St. Augustine's words, *"O felix culpa, quae tantum meruit Redemptorem,"* he explained them as meaning that God "has willed sin in order to be its Redeemer." [74] In his lectures at the University of Wittenberg he taught these doctrines on the authority of St. Augustine, and under the cover of that great name the university accepted them.[75]

Nevertheless the hearers of the audacious friar entertained apprehensions. In 1512, Martin Pollich, the first rector of the University of Wittenberg, after hearing Brother Martin, remarked: "This brother has very deep eyes: he is going to have strange imaginings." In June, 1517, three months before the quarrel over indulgences broke out, Duke George of Saxony, after hearing Luther preach on justification, several times repeated: "I would give much not to have heard that man; such teaching will serve only to give the people a false security and to make them incredulous." [76]

---

[70] Denifle has shown that Luther, claiming to depend on these various authors, whether of the Augustinian or the mystical or the Nominalist school, is not satisfied with making a selection agreeable to his ideas, but often directly falsifies them. (See especially *Luther und Luthertum,* bk. 1, sec. 1, nos. 2, 3, 6, 8.)

[71] *Lutheri opera latina,* I, p. 57.

[72] De Wette, I, p. 16; Luther, *Letters,* translated by Currie, p. 5.

[73] *Opera latina,* I, p. 315.

[74] *Sämmtliche Werke,* XXI, p. 192 sq.

[75] Janssen, II, p. 77. In his commentary on St. Paul's Epistle to the Romans (written in 1515–1516), Luther teaches his system of justification. This commentary is to be found in manuscript 1826 of the Palatine Library in the Vatican.

Strange anomalies are to be met with in Luther's character. When the plague broke out at Nuremberg and he was asked to flee, he answered: "Flee? Never! If I die, the world will not perish for having one monk less." And he stayed to care for the afflicted. He was afraid of glory. "Do not," he said, "praise him who is only ignominy, the poor Luder." He signed one letter: "Martin Luther, the son of Adam the banished." [77] But at other times an immoderate gaiety broke out in his letters and conversation. Thus he wrote to Spalatin: "See that you procure good wine for us," and to Scheurl: "I would rather talk nonsense than be silent." He worked with such energy that, in 1516, he no longer found time to say his Office or to celebrate mass.[78]

His words, his looks, his whole person possessed a magical power of seduction. Irascible and rude to the point of coarseness, in his circle of intimate friends he gave way to outbursts of joy and sadness. More than one man of eminence was won over by the attractive charm of that soul so full of life. There was the naïve Johann von Staupitz, who entrusted him with the most delicate missions, *e. g.*, sent him to Rome in 1511 to defend the interests of the monastery and, in 1517, appointed him to uphold the supposed rights of the Augustinians against the claims of the Dominicans; there was Albrecht Dürer, the great artist, and Hans Sachs, the popular poet, and Reuchlin, the erudite Hebraist; there were the strange Carlstadt and the gentle Melanchthon.

---

[76] Janssen, II, p. 77.

[77] Cf. De Wette, I, pp. 24, 45, 49, 53, 58, 64; Walch, XXII, p. 2276.

[78] "*Raro mihi integrum tempus est horas persolvendi et celebrandi,*" he says in a letter to his friend Lang. (*Werke*, Enders ed., I, p. 66.) Denifle has good reason to be surprised that Luther's Protestant publishers or biographers, such as Köstlin and Kawerau, have not understood the meaning of this word "*celebrandi,*" which signifies "to say mass." (Denifle, *Luther and Lutherdom*, p. 35.)

Despite his robust nature, Luther at this period often had fainting spells and complained of severe pains.

CHAPTER II

Luther's Revolt

The Decree of Indulgences

To build St. Peter's basilica, Pope Julius II appealed to the generosity of the faithful and promised abundant indulgences to donors. In 1514 Pope Leo X, in need of new subsidies, promulgated another concession of spiritual favors. The publication of the papal Bull in northern Germany was entrusted to the Archbishop of Mayence, and the preacher chosen to insure its effective spread was a Dominican, Johann Tetzel.

Tetzel has been undeservedly maligned.[1] It is not true that he preached "the forgiveness of all crimes for money without any question of repentance." [2] But it must be acknowledged that many preachers, including Tetzel, by their manner of offering the indulgences, extolling them and putting a price upon them, did provoke real scandals.[3]

The publication of these indulgences in northern Germany was the occasion for a traffic far from honorable. Albrecht of Brandenburg, archbishop of Mayence, loaded with enormous debts to the Fuggers, bankers of Augsburg, had obtained from Pope Leo X the privilege of using one-half of the money received from the indulgences to pay his creditors.[4] This agreement, soon known to the people, and the excessive increase of concessions of indulgences made during the preceding years, had lessened the people's regard for true repentance, and, as a consequence, some bishops, like those of Constance and Meissen (Saxony), forbade the preaching of indulgences in their dioceses.

---

[1] According to Michelet, Tetzel was a man devoid of morality. This writer says that "Tetzel was well suited to the undertaking. He might truthfully have declared: 'Behold in me one who has been whitewashed by indulgences; after this accomplishment, what may it not do?' " Such an accusation rests only on the words of his enemies; it is a calumny.

[2] Kuhn, I, p. 188, makes this assertion without producing any evidence for it. Hefele, Hergenröther, and Janssen have demonstrated the orthodoxy of Tetzel's preaching. (Cf. Hergenröther, V, p. 194; Janssen, II, p. 79.)

[3] Cardinal Sadoleto protested against these scandals. (Sadoleto, *Opera*, p. 753.)

It was in 1516 that Luther first heard of Tetzel's preaching. While travelling with his superior, Staupitz, he was told that the church bells were rung at Tetzel's appearance in a city, that he came in an open carriage with two chests beside him, one for the indulgence tickets, the other for the money, and that he was wont to say:

"As soon as the gold in the casket rings
The rescued soul to heaven springs." [5]

Staupitz smiled; but Luther flew into a rage. "This Tetzel!" he cried; "I would like to punch a hole in his drum." With his superior's authorization, he began a campaign of inflammatory sermons against the preaching of indulgences.

What we know of the friar's character enables us to understand his eloquence. Impulsive, alternately violent and pensive, overflowing now with joy and then with melancholy, Brother Martin belonged to that class of men who see and make others see whatever they speak about; but he was also one of those who see everything unduly magnified. Luther discovered in indulgences, such as they were preached, the great scandal of the Church, the most terrible of evils, the work of Satan, a hideous leprosy which threatened to spread over all Christendom. "How great are the dangers of this age!" he said, in a sermon preached February 24th, 1517. "Oh, sleeping priests! Oh, darkness deeper than that of Egypt! What an incredible security amidst such great evils! Would that I might lie so as to be able to say that indulgences are so called only because *indulgere* is synonymous with *permittere!*" [6]

---

[4] For the details of this "shameful pact," as Janssen (II, p. 66) calls it, see Hennes, *Erzbischof Albrecht von Mainz,* pp. 4–10, 21–23. We have seen above that, to supply the needs of the Holy See, Rome exacted heavy contributions from the churches on occasion of episcopal elections. At Mayence the pallium cost 20 Rhenish florins, apportioned among the various districts of the diocese. The young Albrecht of Brandenburg, who agreed to be responsible for the payment of this sum, was chosen by the chapter because of that declaration. But, in 1517, he was no longer able to meet his obligations to the Augsburg bankers who had advanced the money. Certain business men suggested that it be proposed to the pope that the Fuggers be paid off out of the indulgence offerings. Leo X made the mistake of listening to the proposal.

[5] *"Sobald das Geld im Kasten klingt
Die Seele aus dem Fegfeuer springt."*

Already before this time, in a Christmas sermon delivered in 1515, he represented those who preached the efficaciousness of good works in place of faith in Christ alone, as birds of prey, swooping down on little chicks and snatching them from their mother.[7] In a sermon on the feast of St. Thomas (1516), he asked whether, instead of preaching the Evangel (*i. e.,* good tidings), it would not be better to preach the Kacangel (*i. e.,* evil tidings).[8] In one of his Lenten sermons in 1517, he set up what he called the Bull of Christ against the Bull of the Pope. "Hear me, O Christian. You have no need of running to Rome or Jerusalem or St. James of Compostela to obtain forgiveness of your sins. Here is the Bull of Christ, conceived thus: 'If you forgive your brother, My Father will forgive you; if you forgive not, you will not be forgiven.' " [9]

There was no doubt but that a powerful orator had made his appearance. "Luther," says Janssen, "handled words with veritable power. He is a true master of German. His style is concise and forceful; his comparisons are striking. He drew extensively from the rich sources of the popular tongue. In the matter of homely eloquence, few men can be compared with him; and when he is inspired by his Catholic past, his words reveal a depth of religious feeling that recalls the finest days of mysticism."[10] The Protestant historian Menzel says: "Luther is now an eagle in powerful flight, now a gentle dove." According to Bossuet, "he had the strength of genius, a vehemence in his discourses, a lively and impetuous eloquence, which captivated the people and carried all before him, an extraordinary boldness when supported and applauded, with an air of authority which made his disciples tremble."[11]

---

[6] Weimar, I, p. 141.

[7] *Ibid.,* p. 31.

[8] *Ibid.,* p. 111.

[9] *Sämmtliche Werke,* XXI, p. 212; Janssen, II, p. 78.

Luther's Theses

Luther's words captivated some and alarmed others. Some declared that while hearing him they were listening to a voice from heaven; others thought that they saw in him some diabolical influence.[12]

In October, 1517, the daring reformer thought the moment had come to make a great demonstration. In All Saints, the parish church of Wittenberg, November 1st was a great feast-day; abundant indulgences were granted to all who, after going to confession and communion, would visit certain chapels. October 20th, Luther preached there on the subject of indulgences. "An indulgence," he said, "is in itself something venerable; it rests on the merits of Christ. But it has become an instrument of greed and placed at the service of Mammon." The next day he fastened his famous 95 theses on the doors of Wittenberg Castle.

---

[10] Janssen, II, p. 208. The friar preacher had recourse, not merely to the language of the common people, but to the most uncouth and inelegant onomatopoeias. The following passage is often quoted from a sermon intended to prove that repentance should not be postponed. "When Sodom and Gomorrha were swallowed up in the twinkling of an eye, all the inhabitants of these two cities—men, women, and children—fell dead and tumbled into the depths of hell. There was no time for anyone to count his money or to gad about. In a single instant every living thing fell dead. Then was heard the drum and trumpet of the good God. They sounded like this: *Pumerle pump! pumerle pump! pliz! schmir! schmir!* This was the sound of the Lord's drum, or, as St. Paul says, the trumpet of God. When God thunders, there is a noise as of a drum: *Pumerle pump!* This will be the war-cry and *taratantara* of God. Then will the heavens resound with this noise: *Kir, kir! pumerle pump!*"

[11] Bossuet, *Variations*, bk. 1, sec. 6.

[12] *"In ejus oculis,"* wrote a contemporary, *"nescio quid daemoniacum elucere solitum."* Proteolus, *De vitiis, sectis, omnium haereticorum.*

It must be recognized that neither in the sermon nor in the theses did he directly and fundamentally deny the value of indulgences, as taught by the Church. The 71st thesis was worded thus: "Whoever speaketh against the truth of apostolic indulgences, let him be anathema." [13] But along with just criticism Luther mingled temerarious ideas. He claimed, for example, that "the pope has not the right to remit any other punishments but those which he himself has imposed" (5th thesis), and that "every truly contrite Christian obtains entire remission both of the guilt and of the punishment of sin" (36th thesis). Moreover, he let it be understood in his sermons that the campaign begun by him had a more general import: he spoke of St. Peter's basilica, "so dear to the devil," of the decline of the clergy, which the pope was incapable of remedying, of the equal powers of pope, bishop, and priest in the matter of Purgatory. These ideas he presented as an exposition of "his doctrine." [14] At this period he began to sign himself "Martinus Eleutherius" (Martin the Free).

Tetzel refuted Luther's 95 theses by 110 antitheses, of which Hefele says: "Whoever reads the antitheses of Tetzel will be forced to acknowledge that he had a perfect understanding of the difficult doctrine of indulgences." [15] But Luther, intoxicated with success and popularity, was no longer open to conviction. His boldness increased. On January 14th, 1518, he declared "that he despised excommunication, that he was going to begin an open war, that he was afraid of no one; for, that which he knows, that which his adversaries are attacking, he has received from God Himself."[16] This was adding to his temerarious ideas on indulgences the evidently erroneous theses of the inefficacy of excommunication and the heresy of individual inspiration.

---

[13] *"Contra veniarum apostolicarum veritatem qui loquitur, sit ille anathema et maledictus."*

[14] Janssen, II, p. 79.

[15] Hefele, *Tübinger Theol. Quartalschrift,* 1854, p. 631.

No doubt these doctrines had not yet reached a positive and definite form in Luther's mind. In that essentially impulsive nature of his, passion preceded the idea. It may be, too, that he recoiled before the consequences of his theories. In February, 1519, he still wrote: "Under no pretext is it permitted to separate oneself from the Church." But external circumstances soon dissipated his hesitation.

The Humanists

The theses affixed to the door of Wittenberg castle spread rapidly in Germany. It seemed to Myconius, who soon after joined the Protestant cause, that "the angels themselves filled the office of messengers."[17] Luther received expressions of admiration from several of his friends, notably Spalatin, Justus Jonas, and Johann Lange. Rudolph von Langen, an aged humanist of Münster, wrote to him: "The time is now at hand when the darkness will be dispersed and we shall have pure doctrine in the churches as well as pure Latin in the schools." Nowhere did Luther's theses receive greater support than among the humanists, or, as they were called in opposition to the theologians, the poets.

German humanism was just then divided into two camps by the famous "controversy over the Jewish books."

The Jewish question was very much alive in Germany in the fifteenth century. The usury practiced by Jewish bankers had stirred up popular hatred against them. Theologians like

---

[16] De Wette, I, p. 132.

[17] Luther's *Sämmtliche Werke* (Erlangen ed.), XXVI, p. 52.

Gabriel Biel proposed to exclude the Jews from intercourse with other men; as a protection for Christian people against Jewish extortion, monks had increased the number of popular banks. But the power of the Jewish financiers kept on growing. At the end of the fifteenth century it constituted a veritable danger for society. "Hatred of the Jews is so general in Germany," wrote Pierre de Froissart in 1497, "that the calmest people are beside themselves as soon as the conversation turns to the topic of Jewish usury."[18] At the beginning of the sixteenth century, Johann Pfefferkorn, a converted Jew, became the interpreter and earnest advocate of a measure which seemed to him the best means of putting an end to the danger to which his former coreligionists were exposing the nation. It consisted in destroying Jewish books everywhere. Many confiscations and auto-da-fes resulted, but the Emperor's intervention was impatiently awaited.

Maximilian wished to take counsel before making any move in the matter. For this purpose he addressed himself to the prelate whom he regarded as the best representative of the interests of the Church, Archbishop Uriel of Mayence, and to the scholar whom he thought best qualified to speak in the name of science, Johann Reuchlin.

Reuchlin was introduced to humanism by the illustrious masters of Florence and had creditably filled the offices of magistrate and ambassador in the service of the Emperor of Germany. Having fallen out of the Emperor's favor, he found consolation in his misfortune by again assuming the professor's robe. He taught Oriental languages and took for his motto: *"Semper discendo docere."* When consulted by the Emperor on the question of burning the Jewish books, Reuchlin courageously answered in the negative. "To refute the Talmud," he said, "is better than to destroy it; the more so as, by consigning the Jewish books to the flames, we would be depriving ourselves of invaluable documents." After seeking the advice of the ecclesiastical authorities, the Emperor's council decided upon a prudent course, namely, to gather up all the suspected books, restore the inoffensive ones to circulation, and preserve those judged useful to science in the public libraries. A violent controversy ensued between Pfefferkorn and Reuchlin embittered the conflict and divided Germany into two camps, which continued the strife for fifteen years.

---

[18] On the Jewish peril in Germany in the fifteenth century, see Janssen, I, p. 371.

Pfefferkorn, irritated by the advice which Reuchlin had given, published a vehement pamphlet entitled, *Handspiegel* (Hand Mirror), to which Reuchlin at once replied by an *Augenspiegel* (A Mirror for the Eyes). All thinkers in Germany took sides either with the *Handspiegel* or with the *Augenspiegel,* and thus the personal dispute between Reuchlin and Pfefferkorn assumed the proportions of a general conflict. It revealed a profound division in Germany between those called "theologians" and those called "poets." The condemnation of the *Augenspiegel* (1513) by the Inquisition and the appearance (1515) of an utterly venomous work, *Epistolae obscurorum virorum,* by Johann Crotus Rubianus [19] and Ulrich von Hutten, filled up the measure of disturbance.

Under the name of "poets," all the humanists, all those animated by devotion to ancient classic literature and contempt for the Middle Ages, rallied about Reuchlin. The most ardent of them was Ulrich von Hutten. He was born of a poor but noble family of Franconia and led the wandering life of a scholar who possessed neither conscience nor morality. In the *Epistolae obscurorum virorum* he displays, along with marvelous erudition and inexhaustible enthusiasm, all the bitterness that was fermenting in his irritable soul. The enigmatic Erasmus, that other nomad with a still greater mind, but with a reserve of judgment which enabled him to survey all the sects without definitely becoming a vassal to any one of them, took no part in the dispute over the Jewish books. Yet we know that the author of the *Praise of Folly* was the friend of Hutten, who loaded him with eulogies, and it was not without good reason that his contemporaries regarded Erasmus as the intellectual father of the pamphlets directed against the "theologians."

---

[19] On Crotus Rubianus and his return to the Catholic Church, see Döllinger, I, pp. 137–141.

The soul of the humanist movement at Erfurt was, as we have seen, Conrad Mutianus. His humanism was unfortunately more pagan than Christian. This canon of Gotha, who abstained from saying mass or receiving communion, was a more open pantheist than Ficino, and almost as brutally immoral as Poggio. "There is only one God and one goddess," he wrote, "but there are many divine beings and many names of divinity.[20] The true Christ is spirit[21] . . . Justice, peace, joy, this is the real Christ descended from heaven."[22] Writing to his friend Herebord von den Marten, he said: "Hurry and get a copy of Bebel's *Facetiae;* they are well told and you will remember them a long time." In the same letter he expresses a desire to make a collection of "facetiae of his own." This was the only exception he was willing to make to his resolve never to write any books.[23] Mutianus did not carry out his plan; but his pupil Tribonius imitated Bebel's *Triumphus Veneris*.

---

[20] Quoted by Janssen, II, p. 29.

[21] *Ibid.*

[22] *Ibid.* Kampschulte (*Die Universität Erfurt in ihrem Verhältniss zu dem Humanismus und der Reformation,* I, p. 86) attributes Mutian's anti-Christian expressions to his animosity toward his colleagues, the canons. But this explanation cannot be accepted. Mutian's ideas may be found set forth in his intimate letters, in which they seem to be a sincere expression of his personal thought.

[23] Mutian had resolved not to write any books, but to impart his ideas by conversation. "This is the only effective means of spreading ideas," he said; "it is the way that Socrates and Christ used." Doubtless there was also a motive of prudence, for, in a letter to a friend, he writes: "Be careful about spreading these things; we must shroud them in silence, as was the practice in the Eleusinian mysteries. In religious matters one ought always to employ allegory and enigmas." (Janssen, II, p. 29.)

It was from the ranks of such men[24] that the pretended reformer of faith and morals sought his first backers. "The humanists," says Janssen, "were Luther's first allies." In his writings we find him offering homage successively to Mutianus, Reuchlin, and Erasmus; if he did not at once address himself to Hutten, it was because the latter, in a spirit of haughty skepticism, had at first declared that he "despised a wretched quarrel between monks."[25] Luther wrote to Mutianus (May 29th, 1516): "The barbarian Martin, accustomed only to cry out among geese, salutes you, a man of the deepest and most exquisite learning."[26] Mutianus, the pagan, greeted Luther as the restorer of Christian austerity; he called him "a new Hercules" and "a second St. Paul."[27] Luther wrote to Reuchlin (December 14th, 1518): "As God reduced Christ to dust through death, and as from this dust the Christian world has come forth, so you have been ground, if I may so speak, and now we see the brave defenders of Holy Scripture arise from your dust."[28] With Erasmus he stooped to downright flattery: "I am not learned enough," he wrote him, "to approach, even by letter, so great a savant as Erasmus. I was raised among the sophists. But I will venture to approach and ask the favor of the great Erasmus, whom the whole world applauds."[29]

In reality, Luther was no more a disciple of Erasmus and Reuchlin in scholarly criticism than he was of Mutianus in morality. But he found powerful auxiliaries in them. They were united in a common aversion to tradition. In the strength of such support, the monk-reformer soon ventured to withstand papal delegates, set the theologians at naught, and defied the two supreme powers of Christendom, the pope and the emperor.

---

[24] Personally Reuchlin was quite worthy of esteem. But the party of the "poets," gathered about him, was rightly subject to suspicion. (Cf. Pastor, VII, p. 251.)

[25] Janssen, II, p. 88.

[26] De Wette, I, p. 21.

[27] Kampschulte, II, p. 30.

[28] De Wette, I, p. 196.

[29] *Ibid.*, pp. 247–249.

Papal Intervention

In April, 1518, at a formal meeting of the Augustinians held at Heidelberg, Luther publicly defended, in the name of St. Augustine, as he said, and against the Pelagian sectarians, the new doctrines of the abolition of free will by original sin, the radical corruption of the human will, and man's absolute passivity under the action of God. Emboldened by his success, the monk expanded the discussion. Henceforth it was not merely the question of indulgences that he treated, but the most fundamental dogmas of the Christian religion. His eloquence, his tone of assurance, the prestige of St. Augustine's authority, under shelter of which he sought to propagate his ideas, as also the spirit of revolt which inspired his discourses, drew new followers to him from both the secular and the regular clergy.

Among them was the Jacobin Bucer, "a man of learning, of a pliable mind, more fruitful in distinctions than the most refined Scholastics, an agreeable preacher, with a somewhat heavy style, but imposing in figure and tone of voice." [30] Then there was Andreas Bodenstein, surnamed Carlstadt from his birthplace, "the most restless and impertinent of men," [31] and Eobanus Hessus, equally renowned as a drinker and a poet, who unblushingly ascribed his own faults to the monks whom he detested.[32]

---

[30] Bossuet, *Variations,* bk. 3, sec. 3. Later on Bucer "married, like the others, even more than the others; for, after his wife's death, he married again, and later a third time." (*Ibid.*)

[31] *Ibid.,* bk. 2, sec. 7.

[32] He is the author of the following verses:

"O monachi, vestri stomachi sunt amphora Bacchi:
Vos estis, Deus est testis, teterrima pestis."

In company with his friend Ulrich von Hutten, he might be seen going through the town crying: *"Pereat Tetzel! Vivat Luther!"*

Luther at this period seems not yet to have dreamed of separating from the Church, but rather of making his own doctrines triumph within the Church.

It was at the beginning of 1518 that the first sounds of the religious agitation in Germany reached the ears of Leo X through the intermediary of the Archbishop of Mayence. This Pope has been accused in turn of having been too disdainful of "a wretched quarrel of monks" and of having taken it too tragically.[33] The truth seems to be more justly expressed by the eminent Protestant historian, Leopold von Ranke, who says that Leo X "showed himself equal to the difficult position in which he found himself."[34] "Lorenzo de' Medici said of his three sons, Julian, Peter, and John, that the first was good, the second a fool, and the third, John, the incarnation of prudence." This third son was Pope Leo X,[35] whose conduct justified his father's judgment. In February, 1518, the Pontiff asked the Vicar General of the Augustinians, Gabriel della Volta, to intervene with the rebellious monk and to employ monastic discipline to make him stop his dangerous campaign.[36] But the attempt met with an obstinate refusal. In a memorial (May 30th), couched in terms of humble obedience, Luther declined to make a retraction.[37] Emperor Maximilian pointed out to the Pope the grave danger of the situation from the social and political point of view and promised to place his authority at the service of the Church if the Pope judged it proper to put an end to the painful agitation.[38]

The writings and theses which Luther continued to publish became more and more temerarious. The Pontiff finally, by a

---

[33] "Leo X, in place of trying to pacify this restless and troubled soul, placed his thunder at the service of Luther's enemies." (Ernest Denis in Lavisse and Rambaud, IV, p. 402.)

[34] Ranke, I, p. 62.

[35] *Ibid.*

[36] Bembi, *Epist. Leonis X,* XVI, p. 18.

[37] Weimar ed., I, p. 527.

[38] Raynaldi, 1518, no. 90.

Brief (August 23rd, 1518) to Cardinal Cajetan, then legate at the diet of Augsburg for the settlement of the Turkish question, declared that if Luther should appear before the papal legate and retract his errors of his own accord, he would receive pardon; otherwise Cardinal Cajetan might inflict the penalties of heresy and excommunication upon him and his followers and requisition the help of the secular arm for the execution of his judgment.[39]

In selecting Cardinal Cajetan to conduct this difficult affair, Leo X gave a new proof of his pacific spirit. The illustrious Master General of the Friars Preachers, a theologian, exegete, and diplomat, was one of the most prudent men of his time.[40] At the outset he refrained from making use of the extensive powers granted him by the Holy See and declared that Luther would receive a paternal reception from him.

Luther's disposition was less amiable. At the first rumor apprising him that a canonical trial might be instituted against him, he wrote the Pope (May 30th, 1518): "Most holy father, I prostrate myself at your feet, placing myself and all I am and have at your disposal, to be dealt with as you see fit. My cause hangs on the will of your Holiness, by whose verdict I shall either save or lose my life. Come what may, I shall recognize the voice of your Holiness to be that of Christ, speaking through you. If I merit death, I do not refuse to die."[41] But on July 10th of the same year, in a letter to his friend Wenzel Link, he expressed quite different sentiments towards the representatives of the Holy See, whom he denounced as tyrants, ignoramuses, and sordid money-grabbers.[42] He purposely exaggerated the condemnation that awaited him. In the same letter he writes: "What can they do with me, a poor sick man, all worn out and wasted? Christ our spouse is a spouse of blood. Pray for your poor servant." [43] On October 8th, after a painful journey, mostly on foot, from Wittenberg to Augsburg, he arrived, worn out with fatigue, at the place which the Pope had designated. But at sight of the ovations that he received, his pride revived. He wrote to his friend Melanchthon (October 11th): "The whole city is full of my name, and everybody wants to see the Herostratus who has lighted so great a conflagration . . . I will rather die than recant what I have well said." [44]

---

[39] On this important Brief, the authenticity of which Ranke questioned, see Kalkoff, *Forschungen zu Luthers römischem Prozess.* This scholarly monograph is the most important study that has been published on Luther's trial from the Brief of August 23rd, 1518, to the Bull *"Exsurge"* (June 15th, 1520).

[40] On this celebrated theologian, see Vacant, *Dictionnaire de théologie catholique,* art. *"Cajétan."*

[41] *"Vivifica, occide, voca, revoca, approba, reproba, ut placuerit; vocem tuam vocem Christi in te praesidentis et loquentis, agnoscam; si mortem merui, mortem non recusabo."* (De Wette, I, p. 112; Currie, p. 30.)

The conference between Cardinal Cajetan and Luther took place on October 13th and the two following days. The importance of this discussion and the false interpretations often given it by even weighty authors require that we examine it with some attention. Knaake's recent critical edition of Luther's works and Kalkoff's scholarly monograph now make this task easier.

"Cajetan maintained his self-respect while upholding the authority of the curia. He declined to enter into any discussion. 'I demand of you,' he said to Luther, 'only a single word of six letters—*Revoco.*' Luther left the city and appealed to the better informed Pope." [45] Thus does Ernest Denis speak of the affair. How incomplete and thereby inexact this appreciation is, we shall see from an examination of the original documents and Luther's own avowals. The latter, first of all, declared that he was received very kindly by the legate, who told him that he was not there as a judge and that the Pope had not commissioned him to enter into a doctrinal discussion, but simply to require three things, namely, a revocation of his errors condemned by the Holy See, a promise not to teach them any more in the future, and abstention from whatever might disturb the peace of the Church. Such a request, addressed to a monk who called himself a submissive son of the Church and who had written the letter quoted above (May 30th, 1518), was a perfectly natural one. The Cardinal did not proceed in a strict and rigid way, but condescended to an explanatory conversation with Luther. The latter began by declaring that "he was not conscious of any error," whereupon Cajetan at once pointed out two erroneous doctrines in his teaching, namely, the denial that the Church possessed a treasury of indulgences and the theory of justification by faith alone without good works. These two assertions had been condemned by the *Extravagantes*[46] of the popes, notably those of Clement VI and Sixtus III. Cajetan added "that the doctrine which denied the supreme authority of the pope was rejected by the condemnation issued against the Council of Basle and the Gersonians."[47]

---

[42] *"Habui nuper sermonem ad vulgum de virtute excommunicationis, ubi taxavi obiter tyrannidem et inscientiam sordidissimi istius vulgi officialium, commissariorum, vicariorum."* (De Wette, I, p. 130.)

[43] *Ibid.*

[44] *"Mei nominis rumore plena est civitas, et omnes cupiunt videre hominem tanti incendii Herostratem . . . Malo perire quam ut revocem bene dicta."* (*Ibid.*, p. 145.)

[45] Ernest Denis in Lavisse and Rambaud, IV, p. 402.

The next day, at his second interview with Cajetan, Luther, accompanied by Staupitz who had just reached Augsburg, protested his submission to the judgment of the Church, but demanded that his propositions be submitted to the universities of Basle, Freiburg, Louvain, and Paris.[48] Cajetan perceived the trap in this reservation. The innovator was trying to transform the dogmatic question into one of pure Scholasticism and to gain time. It was then that Cajetan uttered the famous words: "I do not ask so many phrases of you; I require of you only a single word of six letters—*Revoco.*"

---

[46] *Extravagantes* is the name applied in canon law to papal decretals and decrees of councils not included in the *Decretum Gratiani.*

[47] *"Abrogationem concilii basiliensis recitavit et Gersonistas damnandos censuit."* (Weimar ed., II, p. 2.) This second volume contains, under the title of *Acta Augustana,* Luther's report of his conferences with Cardinal Cajetan, followed by a documentary supplement.

[48] Weimar ed., II, p. 8.

However, by way of condescension, the legate did not refuse to discuss the question of the authority attached to a text of the *Extravagantes.*[49] The entire day was devoted to this debate. Luther argued with such vivacity that at one time the young Roman diplomats who acted as assessors for Cajetan, and Cajetan himself, could not help laughing. Luther never forgave the Cardinal for this irony.[50] This second day ended with a second declaration of submission; but that evening Luther wrote to Spalatin: "I am preparing an appeal, resolved not to recant a syllable. If he proceeds as he has begun, by force, I shall publish my answer to him, that he may be confounded throughout the whole world." [51] The next day the legate, wishing to exhaust all means of conciliation, implored Staupitz to intervene with his spiritual son in the hope of obtaining a sincere retraction.[52] The result of this intervention was a letter which Staupitz thought satisfactory, but which did not deceive the Cardinal. Luther, after thanking Cajetan for his kindness, expressed his regret for having spoken of the Sovereign Pontiff too violently, asked pardon, called the Cardinal "his very gentle father," promised to hear and obey the Church, but retracted nothing except in a conditional and equivocal way.[53]

---

[49] *Extravag. comm.*, bk. 5, *De poenitentia*, IX, ch. 2.

[50] *"Hoc faciebat fiducia sua,"* says Luther's account, *"arridentibus et pro more suo cachinnantibus caeteris Italis familiaribus suis, ut victo similis viderer."* (Weimar ed., II, p. 7.) In a letter to Spalatin, he represents Cajetan as grinning like a fool.

[51] *"Appellationem paro, ne syllabam quidem revocaturus ut per orbem confundatur."* (Letter to Spalatin, October 14th, 1518, in Smith, *Life and Letters of Luther*, I, p. 49.)

[52] *"Vocato reverendo et optimo patre meo Stupicio,"* says Luther, *"ut ad revocationem inducerer spontaneam."* (Weimar ed., II, p. 17.)

[53] *"Reverendissima Paternitas tua dignetur ad sanctissimum Dominum nostrum, Leonem X, istam causam referre, ut . . . ad justam vel revocationem vel credulita-*

The letter was dated the vigil of the feast of St. Luke; it was therefore October 17th. The next day was a Sunday. Cajetan observed silence. In the evening Luther wrote a second letter, informing the legate that he thought he had given sufficient proofs of his obedience and that, not wishing to be any longer a burden to the Carmelites, with whom he was stopping, he was about to leave Augsburg. He said that he deserved no censure and that he did not fear ecclesiastical penalties; for he was aware that he had the grace of God in him. Monday and Tuesday passed without any reply from the Cardinal. Was Luther afraid that the legate had decided to make use of the power granted him by the Pope to have him seized by the secular arm? Tuesday night he secretly left the city, aided by Staupitz, who freed him from obedience to the rule and engaged a peasant to conduct him safely beyond the city.[54]

Before his departure, Luther, with the help of his friends, took measures for having posted on the walls of Augsburg a declaration in which he "appealed from the Pope badly informed to the Pope to be better informed." [55] The monk and his friends had, in fact, while Cajetan was silent, guessed that the Pope was preparing a Bull of condemnation. Luther's letter of October 31st to Spalatin abounds in coarse abuse of the Pontiff, that "rascal who, under the name of Leo X, pro-

---

tem possit compelli . . . Nihil enim cupio, quam Ecclesiam audire et sequi." (De Wette, I, p. 161.)

[54] It has been claimed that Cajetan gave orders to have Luther imprisoned. But this version is refuted by the account of Luther himself, who declares merely that Cajetan boasted of having the necessary powers for Luther's imprisonment; but we know under what conditions. "*Quarto die mansi et nihil fiebat. Item silentium quinta die passus. Tandem consulentibus amicis, praesertim cum antea jactasset se habere mandatum ut me et Vicarium* [*Staupitz*] *incarceraret, disposita appellatione affingenda, recessi.*" (Weimar ed., II, p. 17.) Luther's hasty flight seems due solely to a feeling of panic which came on during the night, a feeling easily explained by his psychology. On October 10th he wrote to Spalatin that he did not have time to take along his breeches.

[55] Smith, *Luther's Correspondence,* I, p. 128; Weimer ed., II, p. 28.

poses to terrify me with this decretal." [56] In order to contrive a new subterfuge, he published (November 28th) another manifesto, appealing "from the Pope ever subject to error" to an ecumenical council.[57]

Luther's conjectures or information had not deceived him. On November 9th, Leo X despatched from Rome to Cardinal Cajetan a dogmatic constitution on indulgences, in which, without any allusion to Luther, the Catholic doctrine was correctly set forth. The Cardinal published it (November 13th) and had copies of it printed and circulated.

But Luther's invectives preceded it everywhere. The constitution failed to produce the expected effect on public opinion. In the intoxication of popularity, the innovator wrote: "We are merely at the beginning of the strife: let the potentates of Rome beware! I really do not know whence all my ideas come. My pen is inviting me to greater things than ever." [58]

Luther and Miltitz

Luther's confidence in the future was all the stronger for having found an avowed protector in the prince elector Frederick of Saxony. When Cajetan requested Frederick to have Luther brought to Rome, or at least to banish him from his states,[59] Frederick took counsel with Staupitz and Spalatin and, on their advice, refused to comply with the legate's request. Luther, who was kept informed by Staupitz, had written to his lord a letter in which he heaped praise upon him and appealed to him as arbitrator. Was not the cause of the

---

[56] Smith, *loc. cit.: "Ille nebulo qui, sub nomine Leonis decimi, me terrere proponit decreto."*

[57] Weimar ed., II, p. 36.

[58] *"Get schon mit viel grösserem um."* (De Wette, I, p. 192.) On Luther's history up to 1530, see Grisar, *Luther,* vols. I and II.

[59] Kalkoff, *op. cit.,* p. 19.

Wittenberg professor the cause of his university? The prince allowed himself to be persuaded. For Luther the support of Frederick of Saxony was precious. There were strained relations between the prince elector and Rome, which had refused a benefice to his natural son; hence he might become the most solid support for the new movement.

Leo X, who was a capable statesman, did not hide from himself the grave difficulties of the situation. Luther had not ceased challenging Cajetan as a Dominican and a Thomist, saying that all the charges against him turned on a rivalry of religious Orders and a Scholastic controversy. The Pope attempted to cut short these recriminations by selecting as negotiator a diplomat of Saxon birth, who was commissioned first to bring the Golden Rose to Frederick of Saxony, then to have an interview with Luther and obtain the desired retraction from him. The Pope's idea was good; but his choice of an intermediary was not a happy one: it fell upon Karl von Miltitz,[60] one of those worldly humanists who had derived from the new culture nothing but frivolity of manners and skepticism of mind.

Miltitz presented the question in the light of a trifling conflict which, he said, Thomas de Vio, that dull theologian, had mistakenly taken too seriously. Besides, was not the fanatical Tetzel responsible for the whole misunderstanding? He concluded that Luther had only to sign a statement tinged with submission and obsequiousness towards the Pope, while reserving his rights of conscience. Miltitz undertook to obtain a word of peace from Leo X. His interviews with Luther, which took place at Altenburg in January, 1519, ended by Luther promising to observe silence on the question of indulgences and accepting the arbitration of a German bishop on the fundamental questions of the case.[61]

---

[60] Pallavicini, in his *Histoire du concile de Trente* (bk. 1, ch. 13, no. 8), says that Miltitz used to talk in a light vein, was fond of drinking, and congratulated himself on not being a priest because, as he said, he would not have been able to fulfil the duties of the priesthood.

It does not seem to us that it can justly be said, with Kuhn, that Miltitz by his pliant diplomacy triumphed over the impressionable and thoughtless soul of Luther, nor with Audin [62] and Hofer,[63] that the legate was worsted by the hypocrisy or cleverness of the monk. The truth is that each of them, thinking perhaps to deceive the other, agreed to deceive the Sovereign Pontiff and to offer him as an act of submission what was merely an equivocal promise.[64]

Luther exulted. On February 2nd he wrote to Staupitz that he was conscious of a divine mission, that God Himself was leading him, urging him, forcing him along.[65] The same day he wrote to Sylvius Egranus: "We separated amicably, with a kiss (a Judas' kiss) and tears. I pretended that I did not know they were crocodile's tears." [66] On March 13th he said to Spalatin: "I whisper it in your ear—I know not whether the Pope is Antichrist himself or his apostle." [67]

---

[61] At least such is the conclusion reached by Kalkoff (*op. cit.,* p. 279) and Pastor (VII, p. 382), as opposed to several authors who admit a more precise agreement on four determined points. There is sometimes cited, as a conclusion of these interviews, a letter (dated March 3rd, 1519), in which Luther calls himself "the filth of the earth" (*faex hominum et pulvis terrae*). De Wette, I, p. 233. Recent investigation has shown that this letter was written January 5th or 6th of that year, but was never sent. (Cf. Pastor, XII, p. 382, and Kalkoff, p. 401.)

[62] *History of the Life, Writings, and Doctrines of Luther,* I, ch. 16, pp. 160–169, and *Histoire de Léon X,* II, p. 479.

[63] *Nouvelle biographie générale,* art. "Luther."

[64] It may be that Luther exaggerates Militiz's traits in his account of their first meeting. But when we consider Cardinal Pallavicini's judgment of Miltitz, we are led to believe that Luther's description is not a mere travesty. We are told that the noble diplomat greeted the monk in this wise: "Ah, is this you, Martin? I was expecting to see an old theologian doting in a corner by the fire, and I find before me a sharp, hale, merry fellow." Then, to relieve Luther of any fear of bodily constraint, he added: "Had I with me twenty-five thousand armed men, it would be impossible to bring you to Rome. On my way here I became convinced of this. The whole way I kept asking people: Are you for the Pope or for Luther? I scarcely found one out of four for the Pope; the other three were for Luther." To these flatteries he added cheap joking: "At times I asked respectable women and innkeepers' daughters: 'What do you think of the Roman See?' To this they would reply: 'Roman seats? We really do not know on what you sit at Rome. Are your seats stone or wooden?'" We can imagine the interview between the "merry" monk and the sceptic diplomat, sitting at a table in a wine-shop, with their elbows on the table and a bottle of Rhine wine before them.

[65] *"Deus rapit et pellit."*

The Theologians

In the eyes of well-informed theologians, all the formulas of submission signed by Luther practically remained a dead letter so long as nothing was done about the grave questions which he raised before the public. These questions concerned free will, the corruption of human nature, justification by faith, and the authority of the pope. This anxiety was voiced by a learned professor of the University of Ingolstadt, Johann Eck.[68]

About 1518, at the request of the bishop of Eichstädt, Eck collected, under the title of *Obelisci,* a series of remarks on the different propositions advanced by Luther. A copy of the manuscript reached Carlstadt,[69] one of Luther's most fiery disciples, who, after distorting many of Eck's statements, published part of the *Obelisci* with coarse abuse of the Ingolstadt theologian. Eck complained of the impropriety of this proceeding.[70] Luther answered him by a pamphlet entitled *Asterisci* and challenged him to a public debate.[71]

---

[66] Smith, *Luther's Correspondence,* I, p. 160; De Wette, I, p. 216: *"Dissimulabam hujus crocodili lacrymas a me intelligi."*

[67] Smith, I, p. 170; De Wette, I, p. 239.

[68] Johann Eck (born 1486) was one of the most learned men of his age. His teacher was the famous pedagogue Adam Potken, who put children of from ten to fourteen years through the complete course of Latin classics as also of Christian authors and modern writers. Eck was equally well versed in the works of Homer, St. Augustine, Gerson, and Aretin. When only twenty years of age, he was in touch with the most eminent scholars of his time, such as Reuchlin and Peutinger. As Janssen says, "Eck was an old-fashioned man of conservative temper. But he was also a zealous champion of all true reform, one of those sages who, while loving the past, knew how to discard what was outworn." (Janssen, I, p. 111.)

[69] Andreas Rudolph Bodenstein, called Carlstadt from his birthplace, Carlstadt in Franconia, was born in 1480. Besides being archdeacon of All Saints Church at Wittenberg, he was also professor of theology at the university. He it was who, in 1512, presided at the session at which Luther won his doctor's cap. "This poor devil of a Carlstadt," Luther wrote later, "for two florins gave us the degree of doctor of theology. He has remained for me the type of shallow dialectician and ignorant rhetorician." (*Tischreden,* p. 575.) Carlstadt was, in fact, a type of those restless and unsettled natures whose inordinate inclinations are re-

The city chosen for the debate was Leipsic. The keenness of the polemics which preceded this important debate and the eager desire to see the famous Brother Martin Luther engage in a public dispute with one of his most learned adversaries, drew to Leipsic a great number of curious hearers, several of whom came from foreign parts.

About the middle of June, 1519, Luther made his entry into the city, escorted by two hundred students bearing arms. The debates, lasting three weeks (June 27 to July 13th), were held at the residence of Duke George of Saxony.

During the first week Luther let his disciple Carlstadt sustain his side of the debate. The subject was free will and the part it has in good works. All agreed that Eck was completely victorious. The fiery Carlstadt made statements which put all the logic on his adversary's side. Luther raged. "What sort of an ass is this playing a lyre?" he cried. "Sweep out this filth, this Johann *Treck*."[72] At the beginning of the second week Luther himself appeared on the rostrum. An eye-witness has left us a picture of him at this period. "Brother Martin," says Pfug,[73] "is of medium height. He is alert and smiling,

---

vealed by critical periods which drive them to extremes. He was a Catholic in 1512, a Lutheran in 1520, a Sacramentarian in 1530, an anarchist in 1534, an Anabaptist in 1545, and shocked the world by the extravagance of his successive views. But in 1519 Luther could not find words adequately to express his praise of the Wittenberg professor, of whom he said: "If our university had several Carlstadts, it would reach the eminence of that of Paris."

[70] De Wette, I, p. 125.

[71] The fact that the public debate was provoked by Luther is evident from several of his letters. (*Ibid.*, I, pp. 171, 185, 216, 276.)

[72] This is a play on the word Eck, which Luther transformed into *Treck* (*i. e.*, filth).

[73] Quoted by Zimmermann, *Luthers Schriften*, I, p. 350.

but so thin that you can count his bones through his skin. His voice is sonorous. He is caustic and biting, readily falls into the use of invectives, and quotes the Bible on every occasion." The discussion turned to the primacy of the pope. Luther, driven by the dialectics of his relentless adversary, was led to reject successively the authority of the Church Fathers in the interpretation of Scripture, then that of the Council of Constance, and lastly that of all the general councils. "Are you, then, a Bohemian, a Hussite?" cried Eck. At this question, Luther was beside himself, cried out in Latin and German, tried to shift the question and evade the issue, plunged into personalities and became so abusive that Duke George, who was present, shook his head and, placing his hands on his hips, said: "Surely, this man is crazy!"

The third week was devoted to the Sacrament of Penance and justification by faith. Carlstadt's intervention brought no victory to Luther's cause, and the latter, foreseeing an unfavorable outcome, left before the end of the debate. His anger was poured forth in coarse abuse of all those who had dared to criticise him on that occasion. When Jerome Emser, private secretary of Duke George, published a work on the questions debated at Leipsic, Luther wrote: "The goat threatens me with his horns. Jerome, beware; both you and your writings show that you are nothing but a goat." The Franciscan August von Alfeld having attacked his ideas on the papacy, Luther wrote to Spalatin (May 5th, 1520): "Brother Augustine has come with his stuff . . . I will give it as an exercise to my servant to make verses and orations against this stolid ox." [74]

It was at this time that Luther won over to his cause one who was to represent, in the Protestant movement, the moderation and urbanity of gentle manners—the mild and peaceful Melanchthon.[75] Bossuet explains this young scholar's adherence to Protestantism, as also that of several other humanists of like character, as follows:

---

[74] On the Leipsic debates, see Luther's letters in De Wette, I, pp. 284–306.

"To reform corrupt morals was an object desired by the universe; and sound doctrine was not explained equally well by all preachers. Many preached nothing but indulgences, pilgrimages, almsgiving to the religious, and made those practices, which are only accessories of piety, the foundation of religion. They spoke little of the grace of Jesus Christ; and Luther, who by the dogma of imputed justice, took a new view of it, appeared to Melanchthon, as yet but young, and more acquainted with polite literature than theology, to be the only preacher of the Gospel . . . The novelty of Luther's teaching and opinions captivated men of wit. Melanchthon was the chief of them in Germany. To erudition, to politeness, and to elegance of style, he united a singular moderation . . . But the tide of novelty bore him down with the crowd. We see him charmed by a sermon of Luther on the subject of the Sabbath, wherein he taught a repose in which God did all and man nothing . . . Melanchthon was sincere and credulous as men of talent often are, and consequently was taken in . . . Luther's confidence impressed him more and more; and with his master he succumbed to the temptation of trying to reform bishops, popes, princes, kings, and emperors, at the expense of unity and peace." [76]

---

[75] Philip Schwarzerd, who called himself Melanchthon (μέλαινα χθών = black earth), was a young professor of Greek at the University of Wittenberg. He was a nephew, or at least a near relative, of the celebrated Reuchlin and a disciple of Erasmus. Döllinger says that Melanchthon "was in many ways the equal of Erasmus and in some respects excelled him." (Döllinger, I, p. 340.) During the Leipsic debate he was seduced by what impressed him as a lofty grandeur and heroic daring on the part of the rebellious friar. Later on, shocked by Luther's despotism and brutal polemics, he tempered his enthusiasm. When the rupture occurred between Luther and Erasmus, Melanchthon took his stand with the latter. But from 1529 to 1534 he was devoted to Luther with whole-souled ardor, and Luther professed unreserved admiration for him. "I take as much account of Philip as of myself," Luther wrote in 1523, "save in knowledge and worthiness, wherein he not only surpasses me, but makes me blush." (De Wette, II, p. 407.)

Encouraged by the enthusiasm of this bubbling youth, Luther wrote: "As Christ, when rejected by the Jews, turned to the Gentiles, so now true theology, abandoned by our conceited old men, may turn to the young." [77]

In that demonstrative and untamed nature, brutal violence at times was replaced by feelings of tenderness and compassion. In 1519 his first adversary, the Dominican Tetzel, now an old man, was dying, weighed down by physical infirmity and mental worry. Abuse and calumny had been heaped upon him by personal enemies, the chief of whom was that unworthy Miltitz who had tried to cast on Tetzel the whole responsibility for the religious crisis at Altenburg. Luther felt pity for this unfortunate man. He wrote to Georg Spalatin (February 12th, 1519): "I am sorry for poor Tetzel. I have nothing to gain from his shame, as I had nothing to lose from his glory." [78] Later he wrote to Tetzel himself: "Do not worry. You are not responsible for what has happened. The child has quite another father."

But these moments of pity and tenderness were accidental and transient in Luther's life. On the contrary, what seemed to grow more and more dominant in him was a spirit of bitterness, hatred, and sarcasm, the fruit of unconquerable pride.

---

[76] Bossuet, *Variations*, bk. 5, secs. 1 and 2.

[77] *"Sicut Christus ad gentes migravit rejectus a Judaeis, ita et nunc vera ejus theologia, quam rejiciunt opiniosi illi senes, ad juventutem se transferat."*

[78] *"Doleo Tetzelium . . . Sua ignominia nihil mihi accrescit, sicut nihil decrevit mihi sua gloria."* (De Wette, I, p. 223.)

CHAPTER III

The Spread of Lutheranism in Germany

THE agitation created by the Augustinian monk appeared more and more clearly as a manifestation of the various intellectual, political, religious, and social tendencies which stirred Germany at that time. In history no less than in geology, visible streams nearly always have their source in underground currents.

Erasmus, the oracle of the humanists, greeted Luther as the man predestined to abolish "Scholasticism, the food of asses, and to replace it by poetry, the royal gift of the gods." Erasmus explained the new doctor's literary vagaries and brutal manner by saying that "the obstinate and obdurate world needed a rude master of that sort." [1]

Alliance of Revolutionary Parties in Germany

The political tendencies of Germany, especially after 1514, exhibited a ferocious hatred of Rome. Ulrich von Hutten praised the ancient glory of Germany and declared that Rome wished to arrest its progress. "The pope is a bandit," he said, "and this bandit's army is the Church." Luther appeared to be the living incarnation of the national party, perhaps its future leader—Luther who attacked the pope so aggressively and whose nature was so thoroughly German (*kerndeutsch*).

New religious tendencies, originating among the mystics of the fourteenth and monastic agitators of the fifteenth century, were disturbing men's minds. The secret followers of

---

[1] Erasmus, *Epistolae*, bk. 18, no. 18; bk. 19, no. 3.

Hus in Germany entered into epistolary correspondence with Luther.[2]

A silent social fermentation manifested itself periodically in bloody conflicts between peasants and knights, between knights and the great vassals of the crown. Perhaps the worst revolutionists were those freebooting knights who, like Franz von Sickingen and Götz von Berlichingen, burned down villages and plundered merchants on the highways.[3] These anarchistic tendencies later on caused not a little German blood to flow in the War of the Knights; these tendencies were not the last to recognize their image in the rebel monk's inspiration against all traditions. Ulrich von Hutten, the friend of Franz von Sickingen, undertook the first overtures looking to a mutual understanding. He wrote (February 20th, 1520) to Luther's friend Melanchthon: "Sickingen has commissioned me to let Luther know that, should he fear any danger because of his opinions, he may address himself to him with all confidence. He is well liked by Sickingen." [4] Luther enthusiastically accepted these offers and wrote to Spalatin: "*Alea jacta est:* Franz von Sickingen and Sylvester von Schamburg have freed me from every fear. I no longer desire any reconciliation with the Romans (Catholics) for all eternity." [5]

Luther's alliance with all the revolutionary parties of Germany was henceforth a fact beyond dispute. The famous manifesto "To the German Nobility" [6] (August, 1520) was a signal for the beginning of the war against the papacy. "A

---

[2] Hergenröther, V, p. 215.

[3] "As we were setting out," says Götz von Berlichingen, "five wolves pounced on a herd of sheep. I enjoyed watching them and wished them good luck as likewise for ourselves. I said to them: 'Good luck, comrades, good luck to you all!' I regarded it as a good omen thus to be entering the campaign at the same time as our comrades, the wolves."

[4] Böcking, *Ulrici Hutteni Opera,* I, p. 320.

[5] De Wette, I, pp. 446, 449, 475.

[6] *Sämmtliche Werke,* XXI, pp. 274–360.

Christian barely emerges from the waters of baptism," he wrote, "when he is a priest. He can then pride himself on being a cleric, bishop, and pope." As for the pope of Rome, "he lives at our expense and by his pomp defies emperors and kings." These latter, established by God to punish the wicked, "should not be respecters of persons and should strike pope, bishops, monks, and nuns without distinction," for "Antichrist himself could not reign in a more offensive manner than the pope of Rome."

"The pope of Rome" at that time was Leo X, a man heartily devoted to art and literature, the protector of Raphael and the friend of Machiavelli. This son of Lorenzo the Magnificent welcomed Erasmus with particular marks of courtesy; but Luther's doctrinal temerity exceeded all bounds.

Luther Excommunicated

After long and mature deliberation, Leo X decided to issue (June 15th, 1520) the Bull of Excommunication, *"Exsurge Domine,"* condemning forty-one propositions drawn from Luther's writings, ordering the destruction of the books that contained them, and threatening Luther with the full rigor of ecclesiastical punishment if he would not abjure his errors within sixty days.

The tone of the Bull was thoroughly Apostolic: "In imitation of the divine mercy, which wills not the death of the sinner, but that he be converted and live, we have resolved," says Leo X, "unmindful of all the attacks directed against us, to employ the greatest indulgence and to do our utmost to bring Brother Martin by the path of gentleness to reflect and to renounce his errors." The condemned propositions were chiefly these: (1) errors concerning the radical corruption of human nature;[7] (2) errors concerning justification by faith alone,[8] indulgences,[9] and Purgatory;[10] (3) errors concerning the pope and the hierarchy.[11]

---

[7] Prop. 31, 32, 36.

It was a mistake to select Doctor Johann Eck, Luther's old foe, to publish the Bull in a large number of German dioceses.[12] The students at Leipsic tore up the papal document and came near putting Doctor Eck to death; at Erfurt there were bloody riots. All the university towns witnessed scenes of disorder. Ulrich von Hutten organized the protestations with tireless activity. Luther's insolence knew no bounds.[13] On August 18, 1520, he wrote to Spalatin: "I am convinced that we have a right to do anything in order to annihilate the papacy."[14] Three months later he says, in another letter to Spalatin: "Never did Satan dare to offer worse blasphemies than are contained in the Bull."[15] On December 10th he lighted a fire before one of the Wittenberg gates and cast the papal Bull into the flames, saying: "Since you have afflicted the holy one of the Lord, may eternal fire devour you." On the next day he defended his act from his professorial rostrum at the university, explaining to his hearers that the burning of the papal Bull was only a symbolic ceremony; what it was important to burn, was the pope himself, that is, the Apostolic See."[16]

This deed of December 10, 1520, marks an important epoch in the history of Protestantism. It inaugurated open revolt against the head of the Church. There is no exaggeration in the metaphor employed by a contemporary who said that

---

[8] Prop. 10, 11, 12.

[9] Prop. 17, 19.

[10] Prop. 37–40.

[11] Prop. 13, 16. See Raynaldi, 1520, no. 51; Denzinger, nos. 741–781. The complete text of the Bull is found in Mansi, XXXII, p. 367, and in Hardouin, IX, p. 1228.

[12] Paquier, *Jérôme Aleandre,* p. 143.

[13] Pastor, VII, p. 408.

[14] De Witte, I, p. 478.

[15] *Ibid.,* p. 522.

[16] Luther, *Opera latina,* V, p. 252.

Luther, in burning the papal Bull before the gate of Wittenberg, kindled the most formidable conflagration that Christendom had ever witnessed.[17]

From this moment Luther became in the eyes of his followers what he himself said he was, the "holy one of the Lord." One of Lucas Kranach's engravings, representing him with his forehead encircled by a halo, was widely circulated among the people. It was rumored that at the moment when he burned the papal Bull, angels were seen above him, encouraging his revolt.

All his allies forthwith bestirred themselves. Sickingen's knights and the Hussites of Bohemia announced that they were ready to march to his defense. According to Luther's affirmation, the Bohemians offered him 35,000 men, and seven provinces were prepared to rise up to espouse his cause.[18] Hutten circulated among the people the most inflammatory of his war songs.[19] In the words of Ernest Denis, "Hutten led to Luther all those who desired a radical revolution. Thanks to him, in 1520, the religious and political movements that were stirring the nation united in resistance against Rome. This alliance marks a decisive date in the history of Germany. What is thenceforth at stake is the very destiny of the Empire and of Europe." [20]

---

[17] Anshelm, *Chronique de Berne,* V, p. 478.

[18] Janssen, II, p. 120.

[19] Here is one of them:

"To nobles' pride I make appeal
Rise up, good towns, arise,
Lift up your hand, ye Germans proud,
The time has come to strike
For liberty. God wills it."

In this new sort of crusade, they even appealed to foreign aid:

"On my immortal soul I swear,
If God who guardeth innocence
Give me the needed grace,
My wrongs I'll right with my own hand,
E'en foreign aid I'll gladly use."

What was purposed was an invasion of Italy and the sack of Rome after the manner of the Goths and Vandals. (Ct. Janssen, II, p. 120.)

A writer full of enthusiasm arose in the camp of those who remained faithful to the Pope; it was the Franciscan Thomas Murner, a great satirist, who, up to his death (1536), coped with Luther, Hutten, Melanchthon, and their disciples by his writings in prose and verse, his sermons, songs, and epigrams. In 1506 he was crowned with the poet's laurel by Emperor Maximilian at Worms and in 1519 he became a professor at Strasburg. Until then he had published only stinging satires against the morals of the time.[21] But the war started by Luther in 1520 seemed to him the supreme religious, social, and political danger against which he thenceforth directed all his power of speech and pen. "The Empire," he said, "has no more dangerous foe than Luther." [22]

Murner, like most of his countrymen, turned his eyes towards the newly elected young Emperor, Charles V, who in the cathedral at Aix-la-Chapelle, with his hands between those of the Archbishop of Cologne, had just taken (October 23rd, 1520) the famous oath which formed, as it were, the basis of the imperial constitution. "Do you promise," asked the Archbishop, "to maintain and protect the Catholic faith, to observe the obedience which you owe to the pope and holy Church, and to sustain them by your acts?" To this the young Emperor, resting two fingers of his right hand on the altar, replied: "Relying on the divine assistance, and supported by the prayers of all Christians, I promise loyally to fulfil all these duties, so help me God and His holy Gospel." [23] A contemporary author remarks: "All the people placed their hope in the newly elected Emperor and looked to him for their deliverance." [24] Nor did Luther and Hutten lose sight of him. For a while they hoped to win him to their cause; but they soon perceived that this hope was vain and made ready to resist him with all their strength.

---

[20] Lavisse and Rambaud, IV, p. 404.

[21] "He who would acquaint himself with the manners of that period or who cares to study the German language in its whole extent, should attentively read these stories of Murner. Nowhere else will he find so well assembled all the qualities of the German tongue: force, harshness, realism, and all that goes to make it suited to raillery and invective." (Janssen).

[22] Waldau, *Thomas Murner,* pp. 84–95; Janssen, II, pp. 128–134.

Emperor Charles V

Charles I, king of Spain, had been elected (June 28th, 1519) Emperor of Germany, under the name of Charles V, despite the formidable competition of Francis I of France and the silent opposition, it was said, of Pope Leo X.[25] He encountered serious difficulties, arising from both the political and the religious situation of the country.

During the deliberations of the electors, the bandit knight, Franz von Sickingen, who was in turn bought by the king of France and by the king of Spain, played an almost preponderant part; and Ulrich von Hutten, a man devoid of morals, might be seen carrying on wary negotiations with the archbishop of Mayence and the margrave of Brandenburg. On the other hand, the Spaniards, displeased at the election and fearful lest the new Emperor would lead them into bloody wars for the benefit of Germany, refused to pay their taxes and threatened to revolt. The treasury of Charles V, who had spent a million florins for his election, was empty. The religious situation was equally disquieting. Jerome Aleander, the papal legate in Germany, with some exaggeration but under the impulsion of a panic fear that was not altogether groundless, wrote: "Nine-tenths of the country is crying: Luther! and the other tenth: May the Roman court perish!" [26] Luther, at the height of his exaltation, proclaimed: "Let Rome excommunicate me and burn my writings! Let her send me to the stake! She will not be able to stop the advance; there is something resembling a prodigy at our very doors."

---

[23] Janssen, I, pp. 407–409; II, p. 139.

[24] Bodmann, *Posthumous Writings,* quoted by Janssen, II, p. 132.

[25] The vacillating policy of Leo X in this affair is analysed and estimated at length by Pastor, VII, pp. 272 sqq. To claim, as Baumgarten does (*Die Politik Leos X,* p. 555) that this policy was dominated by considerations of nepotism, is an error. Family interests had their part, no doubt, but never outweighed those higher considerations whose object was the independence of the Italian States and consequently of the Holy See.

Hutten had tried by flattery to win over the Emperor to the new ideas and hailed him as the Ziska of a new Hus. But the personal sentiments of the new sovereign, as well as his political interests, would not permit him to support the Reformation. Charles, who was sincerely pious, was shocked by the clamor and blasphemies of the sect attaching itself to Luther. As he was charged with continuing the work of Charlemagne and with maintaining the unity of the Holy Roman Empire, he naturally opposed a revolt whose watchword was separation from Rome.[27]

The Diet of Worms

With these dispositions he assembled the diet of Worms (January 27th, 1521). Its first sessions were devoted to the settlement of certain political questions, domestic and foreign. But Luther's name was on everyone's lips. All were waiting to see the diet take up the religious issue and expecting to see the reformer appear there in person.

On February 13th, Aleander, the papal legate, speaking in the name of the Pope, delivered a three-hour discourse which made a deep impression upon his hearers. He set forth how the doctrines of the Augustinian monk and the intrigues of his followers threatened not only the Church, but also the Empire, nay, the whole social order. In conformity with these conclusions, the Emperor submitted to the estates an edict banishing Luther as a disturber of the faith and of the public peace, and declaring as guilty of lese-majesty anyone who in future would declare himself a protector or partisan of the rebel monk.[28]

---

[26] Paquier, *Jérôme Aléandre,* p. 184. On Aleander, see Pastor, VII, pp. 404 and 419-441.

[27] Paquier, p. 172.

The discussion of this edict lasted seven days and was extremely violent. At one of the sessions, Duke Frederick, elector of Saxony, and Margrave Joachim, elector of Brandenburg, almost came to blows.[29] All around the city Sickingen's freebooting knights exercised a veritable reign of terror. There was a fear lest at any moment that terrible band might invade the meeting-place of the diet. Aleander wrote: "Sickingen is the real master of Germany: he has armed men when and as he wishes, whereas the Emperor has none." [30]

The estates refused to approve the imperial edict, alleging that to banish Luther would be to stir up a formidable revolution. But they required that the Augustinian monk should be summoned to Worms and permitted to offer an explanation before the diet. In accordance with this decision, the Emperor wrote to Luther (March 6th, 1521): "You have no need to fear either ambushes or ill-treatment; our escort and safe-conduct will protect you. We count on your obedience. If you refuse to obey, you will at once incur the rigor of our judgment."

Luther's pride seemed at first to be exalted at the thought that he, a simple monk, was to appear before the diet of the Holy Empire, in the presence of the Emperor and the heads of the estates. Exaggerating the perils and forgetting his safe-conduct, he said: "Were they to build a fire reaching to the sky, I would pass through it in the name of God: I will enter the very jaws of this behemoth, break its teeth, and confess the Lord."

---

[28] *Ibid.*, pp. 198–203.

[29] *"Le duc saxone e el marchese Brandeburgh vennero quasi ad manus, et sarebbe fatto, se non fusse messo de meggio Saltzburgh et altri que vi erano."* (From a dispatch of Aleander, published by Balan, *Monumenta reformationis lutheranae ex tabulariis Sanctae Sedis secretis*, p. 62.)

[30] Balan, p. 160.

Luther left Wittenberg on April 2nd; his journey was a triumphal march organized by his friends. Crotus Rubianus, rector of the University of Erfurt, accompanied by forty professors and followed by a great throng of people, went forth three miles to meet him who was hailed as "the Hero of the Gospel," "the Expected One," "the new St. Paul."

Luther preached in the Augustinian church at Erfurt on April 7th, attacking the Holy Father and the doctrine of sanctification by good works.[31] A week later he wrote to Spalatin: "I have decided to force Satan to recoil, and I despise his snares." On the 16th, accompanied by his friends, he reached Worms. The next day he appeared before the diet.

The Emperor presided, dressed in his gorgeous Spanish mantle. Below him sat the two nuncios, the ecclesiastical and lay electors, and the princes, knights, and burgomasters of the imperial cities. More than 5,000 persons filled the hall and its approaches.

In the presence of this assembly, the rebel monk lost his arrogance. The *officialis* of the Archbishop of Treves, pointing to some books on a table and reading their titles, asked Luther whether he was their author and whether he was ready to retract their errors which had been condemned by the Church. Luther answered the first question affirmatively, but asked for a delay before replying to the second. He spoke with such a feeble voice that even those who were very close could scarcely hear him. "He spoke almost in a whisper," reports Philip von Fürstenberg, "and seemed to experience fright and anxiety." [32] Great was the disillusion. "That is not the man," said Charles V, "to make a heretic of me."

---

[31] It was there, according to his partisans, that Luther performed his first miracle. While he was preaching, an unusual noise was heard. The crowd, panic-stricken, rushed pell mell to the doors. Thereupon Luther cried out: "My beloved friends, it is the devil to whom we owe this alarm. But take courage!" "After Luther had threatened the demon, silence was at once restored. This was Luther's first miracle and his disciples gathered about him and attended him." (Kampschulte, *op. cit.*, II, p. 98.)

On the morrow, however, Luther's attitude was changed. In a firm and confident tone, he declared that he was not willing to retract anything, but said he was ready to discuss his doctrines according to the Scriptures. He was then told that there was to be no discussion about the Scriptures, but simply to establish the fact that his doctrines were contrary to those of the popes and the councils. He answered: "I cannot submit my faith either to the pope or to councils, because it is as clear as day that they have fallen into error." During the following days several schemes of conciliation were considered. The *officialis* proposed to Luther that his cause be submitted either to the Emperor, or to a commission of German prelates appointed by the Pope, or to a council soon to be held. Luther rejected the first two proposals and declared he would accept the future council only in so far as the council would conform to Scripture and truth. A public debate was proposed to him, but he refused. When driven to the wall, he finally cried out: "My doctrine was revealed to me." [33]

This complete change of front can be easily explained. Since the evening of Luther's first appearance before the diet, the revolutionary knights had surrounded the diet; the people, aroused in his favor, ran through the streets of the city, shouting the reformer's name. Two days later there was posted on the walls of the city hall a placard with this inscription: "We are four hundred nobles bound together by an oath not to abandon Luther the Just." The placard concluded with the terrible rallying cry of the rebellious peasants: *"Bundschuh! Bundschuh!"* The bundschuh, or laced shoe, its sole studded with large hobnails, was the German peasants' rallying sign, which they used in opposition to the military boot. Hutten wrote (May 1st, 1521): "Franz von Sickingen is with us. At table he has Luther's writings read aloud. I heard him affirm under oath that, in spite of every danger, he could not abandon the cause of truth." [34]

---

[32] Quoted by Janssen, II, p. 169. Cf. Balan, p. 175. The Strasburg ambassadors said they were unable to hear Luther because he spoke so low, *"mit niderer stim."* (Paquier, p. 237.)

[33] Janssen, II, p. 172.

After the failure of these attempts, Charles V ordered Luther to depart without delay, giving him the protection of a safe-conduct for thirty-one days. Luther left Worms April 26, 1521. One month later, when the safe-conduct had expired, the diet passed an edict banishing the reformer and his partisans from the Empire: the princes were ordered to seize his person in case he should contravene the edict of banishment.[35]

Luther had been arrested a few days after leaving Worms, but with an intention quite other than that provided by the edict. Just as he reached the entrance to a forest, close by the city of Altenstein, he was seized by masked horsemen, who put his companions to flight and mysteriously carried him to a solitary fortress, perched like an eagle's nest on a mountain top. These masked horsemen were in the service of the elector of Saxony, Luther's friend and the organizer of the comedy that was about to be played.[36] The solitary stronghold where the banished monk was going to live under the name of "Junker Georg" (Squire George) was the famous castle of Wartburg.

---

[34] Böcking, *Ulrici Hutteni Opera,* II, p. 50. Events will show how he should have reckoned with such an oath. At the very time that Luther was condemned by the diet, we see Sickingen forsake the revolutionary party and offer his sword to the Emperor. Robert de la Mark, with Francis I's encouragement, had invaded the hereditary country of Charles V. The latter, on very advantageous pecuniary conditions, had just enrolled the terrible leader of the bandit knights in his forces. As for Hutten, to reduce him to inaction, it sufficed to promise him, in the Emperor's name, an annual pension of four hundred florins. (Janssen, II, p. 178.)

[35] Balan, p. 223. See Paquier (*op. cit.,* p. 268) on the accusation against Aleander that he had antedated the edict of Worms and on the objections made to the legality of that edict.

Luther at Wartburg

The castle of Wartburg, which belonged to Duke Frederick of Saxony, was an old-time citadel, situated near Eisenach, made famous by the Minnesingers and sanctified by the presence and virtues of St. Elizabeth. To mislead the search that would be made for Luther, the prince circulated a report that, in spite of the Emperor's safe-conduct, the monk, his protegé, had been seized by brigands who took him prisoner and inflicted the most cruel torments on him. The rumor went so far as to affirm that his body had been discovered in a mine shaft.[37]

The author of this kidnapping exploit and his accomplices were doubtless not blind to the likelihood that in the end the mysterious retreat would become known; but they hoped that, with Luther no longer preaching, the Emperor would not attempt a siege of the stronghold. Besides, even in such an event, the followers of Luther might perhaps be able to sustain a siege in such a strong citadel.

It shortly became evident that they would not have to concern themselves with this eventuality. Soon after the closing of the diet, Charles V was called to the Netherlands, then to Spain, where disturbances had broken out, and before long his war with France so absorbed him that Germany, left to itself, felt the influence of the princes favorable to Lutheranism. The edict of Worms was executed only in a few States.

---

[36] "I allowed myself to be confined and hidden. For the present it is necessary to keep silent and suffer," Luther wrote to the painter Lucas Cranach (April 24th, 1521). (De Wette, I, p. 588.)

[37] From the diary kept by the celebrated painter Albrecht Dürer at this period, we see how great a feeling was aroused by these reports. (Thausing, *Dürers Briefe,* pp. 119–123.)

Leo X's death[38] (December 1st, 1521) did not improve the situation. His successor, Adrian VI, was a superior man, whose imperishable glory, as we shall see later, it was to be the first to place his finger on the sore spot of the Church and to point out the course to be followed. He made sincere attempts to reform ecclesiastical abuses; but the fruitlessness of these attempts clouded and perhaps shortened his life. Chieregato's failure at the diet of Nuremberg was a painful blow to him. The nuncio was commissioned to demand, in the Pope's name, the execution of the edict of Worms; but the diet insisted on impossible conditions, called for a council to be held in Germany, and made some vague promises that were never kept.

Luther's cause profited by all these events. On his solitary rock, which he called his retreat of Patmos, the leader of the Reformation, whose exuberant activity had need of an outlet, undertook a translation of the Bible into popular German. That the sacred volume might be placed in everyone's hands[39] was the desire of him who regarded the Epistle of St. James as an "epistle of straw" and rejected it along with the Epistle to the Hebrews and the Apocalypse solely because these three books—so he asserted—did not contain the doctrine of Christ. Thus did Luther set up individual judgment in matters of Scripture.[40] Having a lively, brilliant, and incisive style, now naïve and simple, now striking and lofty, his translation possesses genuine literary value. But what merit of style can excuse the misleading interpretations and clever and dishonest insertions which make his work a profanation of the sacred Book?[41]

---

[38] Two contemporary historians, Jovius (*Vita Leonis X*, I, p. 4) and Guicciardini (*Storia d'Italia*, XIV, p. 4) speak of poisoning in connection with this death. But Pastor, after a critical examination of the evidence, concludes that "everything points rather to the idea that Leo X, like Alexander VI, was the victim of a virulent attack of malaria." (*Op. cit.*, VIII, p. 68.)

[39] Luther's German translation is sometimes mentioned as the first one ever published in the vulgar tongue. But this is not so. Janssen proves that German translations of the Bible were wide-spread in the fifteenth century. He counts, before the Lutheran version, fourteen translations in High German and five in Low German, besides a large number of editions of the Gospels and Psalms. (Janssen, I, p. 45.)

[40] Luther, *Sämmtliche Werke*, XLIII, pp. 115, 156, 158.

Various polemical writings also issued from the castle of Wartburg. Among them is a pamphlet against King Henry VIII, who had criticized one of Luther's works, *The Babylonian Captivity,* and on that occasion had received from Pope Leo X the title of "Defender of the Faith." The translator of the Bible interrupted his labor to call his royal adversary "a crowned ass," "an arrant puppy," "an idiot," "the refuse of pigs and asses," "besmirching the crown of Christ with his filth."[42]

Even these labors did not absorb his restless spirit. A vast correspondence reveals the thoughts that were stirring in that powerful and unbalanced nature. More than once, in the silence of his retreat, Luther was assailed by doubts, by anguish, and by remorse. When he contemplated all that had taken place during the preceding four years—how he, a simple monk, had defied the Pope, the Church, and tradition, he trembled. When he is no longer sustained by the intoxication of popular applause or the fever of battle, his boldness fails him. "I have destroyed," he wrote, "the ancient equilibrium of the Church, so calm and tranquil under papism."[43] And all that for a new doctrine of which he is not sure![44] After all, he says, was even the great Apostle Paul sure of the truth of his teaching?[45] To free himself from this anguish, the lonely reformer tried to persuade himself that the cause of all these scruples is the devil. And he found the means to silence the demon: "It is to drink, play, and joke, albeit immoderately, and even to commit some sin by way of defiance and contempt for Satan; to try banishing diabolical thoughts by the aid of other ideas, as, for example, by thinking of a pretty girl, of avarice or drunkenness, or even by stirring up a violent fit of anger."[46]

---

[41] Eminent scholars, such as Döllinger (III, pp. 135–169), Janssen (II, p. 210), and Hergenröther (V, p. 237), have shown that Luther, in his translation, sought first of all to popularize his doctrine and did not hesitate to falsify the text in order to attain this end. Let us cite one instance. Luther was blamed for translating δικαιοῦσθδι πίστει ("to be justified by faith," Rom. 3:28) by *"allein durch den Glauben"* ("by faith alone"). He wrote to his friend Lynk: "Your papist is tormented by this word 'alone' which I have added. Tell him: 'Doctor Martin Luther wants it so. Papist and ass are one and the same thing. I am not the papists' pupil, but their judge and I am pleased to strut before their ass-heads. I am sorry I did not translate χωρίς ἔργων νόμου ('without the work of the law') by these words: 'without any work of any law.'" (Döllinger, III, pp. 135–169.) At Wartburg Luther translated only the New Testament (published in 1522). The Old Testament was published in 1534 at Wittenberg.

[42] Luther, *Opera* (Jena ed.), II, p. 518; De Wette, III, p. 23.

In reality he strives to stifle the remorse of his conscience by deafening it with the noise of his fits of anger and his diatribes. "I can no longer do anything," he writes, "but at least I can curse. In place of saying 'Lord, Thy will be done,' I say: 'Damned and cursed be the name of papists.'"[47] "Let us abuse the pope! Let us keep on abusing him, but especially when the demon comes to attack us." [48] From Luther's own avowals we may conclude that at Wartburg he tried to drown his suffering in wine. On May 24th, 1521, he wrote to Spalatin: "I sit here the whole day, idle and drunk." [49]

---

[43] Luther, *Sämmtliche Werke,* XLVI, pp. 226, 229; LX, p. 82. Cf. LIX, p. 297; XLVIII, p. 358.

[44] "What amazes me is that I myself cannot have full confidence in my doctrine." (*Ibid.,* LXII, p. 122.)

[45] "By way of consolation in his doubts, he tried to persuade himself that St. Paul never reached the point of firm belief in his own doctrine and that doubt was the sting of the flesh of which he speaks in his epistles." (Janssen, II, p. 185.)

[46] *"Est nonnunquam largius bibendum, ludendum, nugandum atque adeo peccatum aliquod faciendum in odium et contemptum diaboli . . . Quisquis satanicas illas cogitationes aliis cogitationibus, ut de puella pulchra, avaritia, ebrietate, etc. pellere potest, aut vehementi aliquo irae affectu, huic suadeo."* (De Wette, IV, p. 188.) Elsewhere Luther says that he is convinced that "the Gospel does not require any works of us, that instead of saying, 'Do this, do that,' it simply commands us to hold out our apron or cloak and receive, as though it said, 'Accept this gift, believe therein and you will be saved.'" (*Sämmtliche Werke,* I, p. 139; cf. Döllinger, III, p. 35.) So could he write to Melanchthon (August 1st, 1521): "Sin, sin strongly, but believe more strongly." (*"Esto peccator, et pecca fortiter, sed fortius crede"*; De Wette, II, p. 37.) The year before, Luther went so far as to declare in the pulpit: "If temptation comes, and your flesh is inflamed, you become blinded, no matter how ugly the creature may be. Whoever has no water at hand, let him take even dung to extinguish the fire." (Weimar ed., IX, pp. 213, 215.)

[47] *Sämmtliche Werke,* XXV, p. 108.

Did Luther intend to symbolize his internal struggles by an imaginary scene? Did he believe that he saw or did he really see the devil? In a writing on *Private Mass* (1533) he narrates a dialogue with the devil, which he seems to place at the Wartburg.[50]

"It is surprising to see how seriously and animatedly he describes his awakening, as in a surprise, in the dead of the night; the manifest apparition of the devil to dispute against him. The terror with which he was seized, his sweat, his trembling, and the horrible palpitation of his heart in this dispute; the strong arguments of the demon, who leaves no repose to the mind; the sound of his thundering voice; his oppressive ways of arguing, when he makes both question and answer perceptible at once . . . When Luther appears convinced and unable to answer anything more, the devil presses no farther, and Luther rests satisfied he had learned a truth of which he was ignorant before. If this be true, how horrible to be tutored by such a master! If Luther fancied it, what illusions, what dismal thoughts occupied his mind! If he invented it, how sad a story had he to boast of." [51]

---

[48] Walch ed., III, p. 136.

[49] *"Ego otiosus et crapulosus sedeo tota die."* (Enders, III, p. 154.) It has been contended that this expression is an exaggeration and a joke. But this "joke" is several times repeated under Luther's pen. In 1522 a certain Count Roger von Mansfeld wrote to a friend that at first he had been very much drawn to Luther, but that he became convinced that Luther was nothing more than a blackguard; that he used to get drunk and led an easygoing life. (Cf. Grisar, *"Der 'gute Trunk' in den Lutheranklagen"* in the *Historisches Jahrbuch,* XXVI, p. 479.) Melanchthon wrote about an evening spent with Luther (October 19th, 1522): "There was drinking and shouting as usual." (*Corpus reformatorum,* I, p. 579.) In 1522, shortly after leaving the Wartburg, Luther formed his theory of intoxication as follows: *"Ebrietudo* (drunkenness) is to be borne with (*ferenda*), not inebriation (*ebriositas*)." (Denifle, *Luther and Lutherdom,* p. 111.) In 1530 he wrote: "What other do you think might be the reason I drink the more heavily, prate the more loosely, and carouse the more frequently, than to mock and to vex the devil, who set himself to mock and to vex me." (Quoted by Denifle, *l.c.*) In 1535 he signed a letter *"Martinus Lutherus, doctor plenus."* (Quoted by Denifle, *l.c.*) On Luther's inclination to drink, see Benrath, *Luther im Kloster,* pp. 71 sqq., and Kalkoff, *Aleander gegen Luther,* pp. 141 sqq. These last two authors take Luther's side.

[50] The devil said to him: "You who have been saying mass for fifteen years." As Luther was ordained a priest in 1507, the dialogue must have taken place in 1522.

The solitude of the Wartburg weighed on Luther; his disciples were calling for him to come to them. He himself longed to go to Wittenberg, where the fiery Carlstadt, profiting by the master's absence, was pushing his doctrine to its logical consequences, preaching the closing of monasteries and leading the mob to the pillage of churches. At Zwickau some Hussites, making use of Luther's name, were teaching millenarianism, condemning the universities, cursing science, suppressing infant baptism, and denying everything outside their own views.

Luther, therefore, quit the Wartburg on March 3rd, 1522, and betook himself to Wittenberg, there to rejoin his faithful disciples and repress the "errors" of his compromising followers.

The Height of Luther's Success

The year 1522 marks the apogee of Luther's popularity. All the new currents of opinion agitating Germany in the intellectual, religious, political, and social order rallied about him as their leader. The part he took in the famous debate at Leipsic, at Wittenberg where he burned the papal Bull, at Worms where he asserted himself in the presence of the Emperor and the estates, drew the eyes of all towards him. His life of retirement at the castle of Wartburg gave his features a sort of fascination, which mystery and misfortune always lend to the renown of great men. He was in the full power of his prodigious talent. "He had," says Bossuet, "a great strength of genius; he lacked nothing but the rule, which can be had nowhere but in the Church and under the yoke of a legitimate authority." [52]

---

[51] Bossuet, *Variations*, bk. 4, sec. 17.

In 1522 Franz von Sickingen, suddenly abandoning the service of the imperial armies, placed himself at the head of a league of knights formed at Lindau for the regeneration and independence of Germany. His castle of Ebernburg, near Kreuznach, the headquarters of the league, became a rendezvous for the leaders of the Lutheran party. It was the time when the popular poet Hans Sachs sang the praises of "the Nightingale of Wittenberg," [53] when the painter Albrecht Dürer drew inspiration for his pictures from Lutheran doctrines, and when numerous monks, misled by so many writings, songs, discourses, murmurings, and rumors, left their monasteries and placed their popular eloquence or the prestige of their learning at the service of the reformer. Frederick Myconius preached Lutheranism at Weimar; Conrad Pellicanus taught it at Basle; Osiander propagated it at Nuremberg; Oecolampadius was about to spread it throughout Switzerland.

Calvin, whom Osiander calls "a brutal man, a wild beast incapable of being tamed," and whose "extreme arrogance" [54] is blamed by Melanchthon, later on disturbed the Protestant world by his strange doctrines on the real presence and on justification.[55] He was a man of genuine learning, forcible eloquence, and cheerful enthusiasm, who did not hesitate at a coarse or blasphemous allusion.

---

[52] *Ibid.,* bk. 2, sec. 30.

[53] This is the title of a poem published in 1523 by Hans Sachs in praise of Luther.

[54] Quoted by Bossuet, bk. 8, secs. 12, 13.

[55] He maintained that justification is effected in us, not by the imputation of Christ's justice, as the other Protestants would have it, but by an intimate union of God's substantial justice with our souls. The doctrine of the real presence he exaggerated, going so far as to declare that we ought to say of the Eucharistic bread, "this bread is God." This doctrine is called impanation. (Bossuet, bk. 8, sec. 11.)

While Osiander resembled Luther in temperament, Oecolampadius rather recalled Melanchthon. "From the feet of the crucifix, before which he had been accustomed to pray, he wrote such tender things to Erasmus on the ineffable sweetness of Jesus Christ, whom this pious image represented to his imagination, that one cannot read them without being affected . . . He became a religious with much courage and deliberation . . . However—such is human weakness and so great the contagion of novelty—he left his monastery, preached the new reformation at Basle, where he was pastor, and, tired of celibacy, like the rest of the reformers, married a young girl with whose beauty he was enamored. 'This,' said Erasmus, 'is the way they mortify themselves.' "[56]

In 1522 the Reformation was openly preached at Magdeburg, Ulm, Hamburg, and Breslau. Beginning with 1521, the city administration of Nuremberg was in the hands of the so-called Martinians, *i. e.,* adherents of Martin Luther. It is true that many Catholics who rallied about Luther intended to remain faithful to their religion. They thought it was only a question of reacting against abuses which shocked them in the Roman Church. But pride, sensuality, the fascination always exercised by the words "liberty of belief and of conscience" have a powerful influence upon the masses. A doctrine that permits every man to make himself the judge of his own belief without the guidance or restraint of any authority, which rejects celibacy, vows, and good works, and indulges the passions,[57] assuring all of the kingdom of Heaven if they will but believe, easily attracts the ignorant. The princes, who had long coveted the property of the Church, were eager to accept a doctrine which promised them a great part of the booty, and at an assembly of the imperial cities held at Spires decided that it was the duty of the civil authority to have the "pure Gospel" preached and explained; as a rule it was Luther's interpretation of the Gospel that was imposed by the cities.[58]

---

[56] *Ibid.,* bk. 2, sec. 24. Oecolampadius' real name was Johann Hausschein. He translated it into Greek, calling himself Oecolampadius, "light of the house."

[57] Cf. Denifle, p. 99, and Bossuet, bk. 6, sec. 11, for Luther's theories on chastity. Cf. Cristiani, *Luther et le luthéranisme,* pp. 207–258.

The Duke of Pomerania, who declared that he wished to be converted to the "pure Gospel" and to seize the goods of the Church "so as to make a Christian use of them," [59] spread Lutheranism in his domain. The new doctrine made rapid progress in the electorate of Saxony.

The most notable apostasy was that of the grand master of the Teutonic Order, Albrecht of Brandenburg. He was put in touch with Luther by Osiander, who had met him at the diet of Nuremberg, in 1523. When he visited Luther at Wittenberg the following year, the latter advised him to abandon "the false and silly rule" of his Order, to marry and to convert the possessions of the Teutonic Order into a hereditary estate. The duke followed this advice, disposed of the domains of which he was custodian, gave land and appointments to those of his religious who were ready to follow him, exiled the recalcitrant, reserved to himself the appointment of preachers and pastors, and forbade the preaching of any other doctrine but the "pure Gospel." In 1526 he decided, in spite of his vow of chastity, to marry Princess Dorothea, daughter of the king of Denmark. In a letter inviting Luther to the marriage, he wrote: "We have given up the sign of the cross to embrace the lay state; and as we desire, after your example and that of several others, to labor for its increase, we have married in God the Princess Dorothea. We will celebrate our princely wedding on St. John's day at Königsberg in Prussia." This was the origin of the hereditary duchy of Prussia.[60]

---

[58] The text of this important declaration may be found in Janssen, II, p. 367. It is the principle that gave rise to the famous formula: *"Cujus est regio, illius sit et religio."*

[59] Janssen, II, p. 366.

Meanwhile the Lutheran doctrines had let loose a veritable social and religious revolution in Germany.

Lack of Union among Luther's Followers

In 1522, in the castle of Ebernburg, which had become the boisterous headquarters of German knighthood and the religious reformation, Luther felt himself engulfed by the revolutionary forces which he had mistakenly unchained in the nobility. These anarchical forces split up the humanists, stirred up the masses, won over many of his own followers, passed beyond his own control, compromised him, led him into adventurous undertakings, and finally, when he tried to oppose them, turned violently against him. At sight of the ruins heaped up about his person, the reformer fell into a gloomy discouragement that clung to him up to his very death.

Under the command of Franz von Sickingen, the knights' campaign, begun in 1522, became a truly revolutionary undertaking. "The knights," says Ernest Denis, "needy and turbulent, haughty and brutal, by one of those illusions not unusual in factions, had welcomed the reformation as a sort of resurrection of the Middle Ages for their profit. That faction or party whose ambition was anarchy, had found a worthy leader in Franz von Sickingen, whom popular fancy regarded as a hero, but who in reality was nothing more than a common freebooter." [61] This revolutionary trick miscarried. The energetic resistance of the archbishop of Treves, seconded by the landgrave of Hesse and the count palatine of the Rhine, forced Sickingen to retreat. He surrendered (May 6th, 1523) and soon after died of his wounds. His friend Ulrich von Hutten, exiled to Zurich, succumbed a little later. Luther knew the distress of the revolutionary leaders at seeing their work slip out of their hands; he feared to alienate the prince electors, whose help he needed, and therefore disavowed the knights. They never forgave him for this desertion.

---

[60] It is well known that Albrecht of Brandenburg was not happy either in his family or in the government of his duchy. His duchy was the theatre of ceaseless revolutions. It was with sadness that he later on asserted that he would have done better "to herd sheep than to attempt to govern men." From his marriage with the daughter of the king of Denmark he had seven children, six of whom died at an early age. From a second marriage, contracted with a princess of Brunswick, he had a blind daughter and his only son, Albert Frederick, who throughout life was subject to fits of hypochondria and violent madness, which sometimes led him to hurl dishes at his guests' heads. On the origin of Prussia, see Janssen, II, pp. 79-86.

The next year (1524) it was the humanists who, following the example of Erasmus, clamorously separated from the head of the reformation. Erasmus, shocked at Luther's attacks on human liberty, wrote his work *De libero arbitrio,* which started a lively polemic. Reuchlin, Melanchthon, Staupitz, Luther's best friends, abandoned him. Staupitz abjured him "so as not to mix with the horde of ill-famed people who followed him." [62]

In 1525, the masses of the people turned against Luther and fought him. The terrible comrades of the Bundschuh, who four years previously, during the diet of Worms, had threatened to rise up in the reformer's defense, in 1524 rose up on their own account. The peasants had embodied their demands in twelve articles, which called for the reduction of forced labor, the suppression of tithes, freedom of waters and forests, and especially the observance of the Decalogue and the maxims of the Gospel.[63] Unfortunately, their methods were anything but evangelical. In a few weeks they burned down hundreds of castles, monasteries, and libraries. But they, too, in turn were soon crushed. The vengeance of the nobles was atrocious. It is related that within the territory of the Swabian League alone, before the end of 1526, more than ten thousand executions took place. Luther thought it his duty to turn against those whom his doctrines had aroused. During the war he wrote his book "Against the Murderous and Robbing Rabble of Peasants," in which he thus exhorts the princes: "Seize, strike, slaughter, from front or rear: if you fall, it will be a martyrdom." Meanwhile the terrible and malicious Erasmus wrote to Luther: "We are now gathering the fruits of the new spirit. You do not wish to recognize the rebels; but they recognize you quite well. We know without question who instigated this rebellion." [64]

---

[61] E. Denis in Lavisse and Rambaud, IV, p. 416.

[62] Luther himself reports Reuchlin's words in all their crudeness. *"Tu scribis,"* he wrote, *"mea jactari ab iis qui lupanaria colunt. Et neque miror neque metuo."* (Letter of June 27th, 1522.)

[63] It is because of this last demand that the Socialist Lassalle treated the peasants of the Bundschuh as reactionaries, because they pursued the ideal of the Middle Ages, that is, of a society governed by religious principles, while, according to him, the nobles worked for the laicization of the State.

These princes, to whom Luther gave such strange encouragement, were not irreproachable themselves. With less shouting and tumult than the incendiary and murderous peasants, but with no less culpable avidity, they had rapaciously pounced upon the possessions of the clergy. When Melanchthon, at the diet of Augsburg, seeing so many princes adorned with gold stolen from the monasteries, ventured a timid suggestion of restitution, they would not listen to it.

Thus the preachers of the new doctrine had lost their authority over men's minds and an internal process was at work ruining the doctrines and morals of the pretended reformation.

The Sacramentary Dispute

The great discussion known as the "sacramentary dispute" had created havoc among the doctors. Contrary to Osiander, who in a way exaggerated the real presence and divinized the altar bread by his theory of impanation, Carlstadt, with his usual boldness, denied the presence of Christ in the Host. "I interpret," he said, "these words of the Gospel, 'This is my body,' in the same way that Martin Luther interprets those other words reported in St. Matthew's Gospel, 'Thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build my church.' "[65] But in 1526 a dialectician of greater power had lent his assistance to the dissident reformer and maintained his thesis with more weighty arguments. It was Zwingli, pastor of Zurich in Switzerland (1484–1531). "He was a daring man, whose fire surpassed his learning; in language, clear and intelligible, not excelled by any of the pretended reformers in a precise, uniform, and coherent way of expressing his thoughts."[66] Maintaining that "whatever exists is God," that "original sin damns no one," that Baptism is purely a symbol, and that the Sacraments are vain ceremonies,[67] he could not accept the real presence of Christ in the Eucharist as the Church understands it. He claimed to base his denial on the scientific interpretation of Scripture. In the expression, "This is my body," he said, the verb *to be* evidently has the meaning *to signify,* as in such other Biblical expressions as, *I am the true vine,*[68] *I am the door,*[69] *the rock was Christ,*[70] *it* (the lamb) *is the Phase of the Lord.*[71] "Zwingli and Oecolampadius wrote in defense of this new dogma: the former with much wit and vehemence; the latter with much learning and an eloquence that, 'were it possible,' says Erasmus, 'and if God permitted it, were capable of seducing even the elect.' "[72]

---

[64] Cf. Janssen, II, pp. 484-488.

Luther, notwithstanding his errors on the Eucharist, was never able to doubt the real presence,[73] invincibly struck, as he was, with the force and simplicity of Christ's words, "This is my body." He eagerly took up the defense of the realistic interpretation of this passage. Unfortunately, he denied transubstantiation and in its place admitted a sort of consubstantiation or "companation," as it is technically called, saying that Christ was "with the bread" and that the words "This is my body" mean, "This contains my body." But the Zwinglians, with whom he found fault for translating it by, "This signifies my body," forcibly replied: "If it is lawful for you to admit in the words of institution that rhetorical figure which puts the part for the whole, why do you try to prevent us from admitting in them that figure which substitutes the thing for the sign? Figure for figure, the metonomy which we acknowledge is worth fully as much as the synecdoche which you admit. These gentlemen were humanists and grammarians. All their books were filled with the synecdoche of Luther and the metonomy of Zwingli; it was necessary for Protestants to engage on one side or the other of these two figures of rhetoric; and it appeared manifest that none but the Catholics, equally distant from one and the other, and admitting in the Eucharist neither bread nor a bare sign, justly established the literal sense." [74] "Yet the excesses to which they went on both sides, discredited the new reform with people of good sense. This dispute upset the common foundation of the two parties. They thought they could put an end to all disputes by Scripture alone and they wanted no other arbiter but that. Yet everyone saw that they were endlessly at odds over the meaning of Scripture, and particularly over one passage that should be most clear, inasmuch as it is Christ's last will and testament. . . . Erasmus, whom they tried to win over, said to them, as did all the Catholics: 'You summon all to the pure word of God, and you consider yourselves its true interpreters. Agree among yourselves before laying down the law for the whole world.' "[75]

---

[65] Luther had maintained that Christ pointed to Himself when saying, "Upon this rock I will build My church." Carlstadt held that He also pointed to himself when he said, "This is My body."

[66] Bossuet, *Variations,* bk. 2, sec. 19.

[67] See Möhler, *Symbolism,* pp. 194 sqq.; Janssen, IV, pp. 92 sqq.

[68] John, 15:1.

[69] John, 10:7.

[70] I Cor., 10:4.

[71] Ex. 12:11.

[72] Erasmus, *Epistolae,* bk. 18, ep. 9; Bossuet, *op. cit.,* bk. 2, sec. 25.

---

[73] "I would have been greatly pleased," he wrote, "to have anyone show me a good way to deny it, because nothing would have served me better in my plan to injure the papacy." (*Epist. ad Argentin.*)

[74] Bossuet, bk. 2, sec. 35.

Luther suffered from this obstacle to the progress of his work. "He causes me unwonted distress," wrote Melanchthon, "by his long tales of woe."[76] "Strange agitation," says Bossuet, "of a man who hoped to see the Church repaired, and now sees her ready to fall by the very means taken for her reestablishment!"[77]

Luther's Marriage

Other trials of a more personal nature harassed the soul of the apostate monk. He who had showered so many sophisms, coarse epigrams, and wrathful apostrophes upon celibacy, was in no hurry to get married. Did he dread the terrible raillery of Erasmus, who contemptuously poked fun at Carlstadt's marriage? Was he afraid of incurring the displeasure of Frederick of Saxony, who called the marriage of priests a disguised concubinage? But, as has been truly said, it was impossible that so froward a panegyrist of marriage should keep his vow of chastity and die in celibacy: he was bound to yield to the physical necessities which he so luridly depicted.

After the death of the elector Frederick, while the cannon thundered and the peasants' blood was being poured out, he married Catherine von Bora, a twenty-six year old nun of the convent of Nimptschen, from which she had been removed by Leonard Köppe, councillor of Torgau; she was then secretly hidden in the convent of Wittenberg. The monks, whom

---

[75] Erasmus, *Epistolae,* bk. 18, ep. 3; bk. 19, ep. 3, 113; bk. 31, ep. 59, etc.

[76] Melanchthon, *Epistolae,* IV, p. 76.

[77] Bossuet, bk. 2, sec. 41.

Luther had so scoffed at, at once took their revenge. Epithalamiums, odes, sacred and profane canticles, couplets, poems both heroic and comic—their muse freely employed every tone and idiom. Long after Luther's marriage the sound of the mocking hymns was still heard.[78] "By this marriage," said Luther, "I have rendered myself so vile and despicable that all the angels will laugh and all the devils will weep."[79]

Married life seems not to have brought Luther all the consolation he expected. We see this fiery reformer, who had defied pope and emperor, bow to Catherine's dominance and to complain of it to his friends with an irony that seemed intended to anticipate their mockery. He ends more than one of his letters in this way: "Catherine, my mistress, my empress, greets you" (*Dominus meus, imperatrix mea, Ketha, te salutat*). To escape her garrulousness and foolish questions, he would often take some bread, cheese, and beer, retreat to his study, and lock the door. "Patience with the pope," he once said, "patience with my disciples, patience with my Catherine: my whole life is nothing but a trial of patience."[80] We scarcely need to add that many a time he lacked patience with his Catherine, just as he did with the pope and with his disciples. His character became soured.

The Diet of Augsburg

The opposition of his followers became intolerable to the leader of the Reformation, who forgot that he had enunciated the maxim that religion should not seek the support of force. Under the direction of the landgrave Philip of Hesse, who embraced the new doctrine in 1527, the Lutherans raised an army, and this made them so confident that they thought they were in a condition to protest against the decree of Spires, issued against them the next year. This was the occasion of their assuming the name "Protestants." In the same year (1529) the landgrave, understanding that diversity of opinions would be a permanent obstacle to common action, brought about the celebrated conference of Marburg,[81] at which Luther and Zwingli argued the question of the real presence. There was an attempt to agree on some equivocal formulas, but the two leaders parted more divided than ever.

---

[78] Laffay, *Origines du protestantisme*, p. 54.

[79] Quoted by Kraus, *Histoire de l'Eglise*, III, p. 45.

[80] Catherine often had cause to complain of the contempt shown her by the women of Wittenberg. Luther, in his *Tischreden*, acquaints us with the anxieties that at times disturbed the unfortunate woman. One day she said to him: "Master, how is it that, when we were papists, we prayed with so much faith and zeal, whereas now our prayers are so lukewarm and spiritless?" (*Tischreden*, p. 218.)

A supreme means was then tried by the Emperor and, for a moment, it seemed that a union would be realized not only between the Protestants, but between all Christians. Emperor Charles V (January 21st, 1530) invited the estates to a diet, to be held at Augsburg on April 8th. The principal object of the assembly was to consider a national peril. The Turks, under the leadership of Soliman, had just laid siege to Vienna with an army of 350,000 men and were holding sway over Hungary.

It soon became apparent that no concerted action against the infidel invader was possible unless an accord could be established between the Christians. The learned and astute Melanchthon undertook to demonstrate that such an accord could easily be reached, first of all because the Protestants had never separated from the Church and had only sought to go back to the true notion of the Church as held by the Apostles and the early Fathers, and because it was possible to draw up a confession of faith acceptable to all Christians.

Such a confession was in fact drawn up and presented by him in two parts: the first contained the Protestant doctrine in twenty-one articles; the other, in seven chapters, enumerated the so-called abuses of the Church, which it was desired to correct. We must acknowledge in the first part a genuine effort to render the Protestant formulas acceptable to the Catholics. But, aside from the fact that several articles merely concealed fundamentally grave differences by means of equivocal expressions, there was an essential point separating the Protestants from those Christians who remained faithful to the pope. A learned historian says with great clarity: "In this vast religious quarrel it was not a question of such or such a dogma, of maintaining or reforming such or such a disciplinary law; strictly speaking, the discussion had only one object: the admission or rejection of the infallible teaching office of the Church. The Protestants denied that office. At the same time they rejected the perpetual sacrifice, because it supposes in the bosom of the Church the existence of those supernatural operations which have Christ for their author. Thus did every effort at reconciliation remain ineffective." [82] The second part created a new obstacle to the union; for on several points of doctrine, such as devotion to the saints, the veneration of images, the value of the Sacraments, and supernatural merit, the Augsburg Confession attributed to the Roman Church opinions which she never professed.[83]

---

[81] Janssen, III, pp. 166–169.

Nor did an understanding between the Protestants appear any easier. Zwingli had communicated to the diet a confession of faith quite different from that of Melanchthon. The four cities of Strasburg, Lindau, Constance, and Memmingen had sent a third draft. Melanchthon, moreover, because of his concessions and compromises, was regarded as a traitor by members of his own party. But no one opposed an agreement more violently than Luther. Having been proscribed by the edict of Worms, and not daring to show himself at Augsburg, he wrote to his friends from Coburg: "No union is possible so long as the pope will not renounce the papacy"; [84] and again: "If the canon and private mass be admitted, one must needs reject the whole Protestant doctrine." "In truth, I am bursting with anger and vexation," he said; "in the name of God, cut short the question, cease your quibbling, and come back home." [85]

---

[82] *Ibid.*, p. 193.

[83] Bossuet (bk. 3, sec. 63) sets forth at considerable length and refutes these assertions of the Protestants, which he rightly calls calumnies. "We see," he concludes, "the Lutherans would relinquish many things, and almost all, I dare say, if they would only take the trouble to lay aside the calumnies with which they charge us."

Thus the Augsburg attempt at effecting a reconciliation failed. Yet it was an event of capital importance in the history of Protestantism that an attempt had been made to formulate its dogmas into a profession of faith and to have them protected by the secular authority. By that single fact *Protestantism* broke with *Lutheranism.* Later on, "orthodox" Protestants appealed to the Confession of Augsburg as their symbol of faith, while "liberal" Protestants proclaimed their attachment to that primitive Lutheranism, that utmost individualism, that Christianity without a Church, that Gospel without a hierarchy and without dogma, or almost so, which formed the religion of Luther's first disciples.

The Smalkaldic League

The diet of Augsburg had only placed in evidence the irreducible opposition between the majority of Protestants, especially Luther, on the one hand, and the Roman Church on the other. In his *Notice to my Beloved Germans on the Conclusions of Augsburg,* Luther said: "The papists have on their side neither divine right nor human right." A league, called the Smalkaldic League, was formed (February 27th, 1532) between electoral Saxony, Hesse, three other states, and eleven cities, with a view to defend "the word of God against every attack." The political complications of Europe aided the rebels. On April 21st, Francis I, taking this occasion to weaken the imperial power and to encourage anarchy in Germany, promised his aid to the League; on May 3rd, Henry VIII, who was on the point of repudiating Catherine of Aragon, the Emperor's aunt, in order to marry Anne Boleyn, added his promise to that of the French king. Denmark also gave its adherence. The dukes of Bavaria, jealous of Ferdinand, in turn joined the League. The League was not without some hope of obtaining the Sultan's support, who was threatening to invade Germany. The gravity of the danger led the Emperor (June 12th, 1532) to grant the so-called peace of Nuremberg, providing that, until the next council, all trials "for matters concerning the faith" should be suspended. This is what was called the Interim.

---

[84] De Wette, IV, p. 147.

[85] *Ibid.,* p. 170.

The Anabaptists

But the war was rekindled by various incidents, of which the chief one was the founding of the "Kingdom of the Anabaptists" at Münster under the protection of the landgrave Philip of Hesse.

In the city of Strasburg, where the Zwinglian doctrines had been disseminated since 1524, some men had been exalted by Luther's words, "Every Christian is the judge of those who teach him, because God Himself instructs him from within," and by these words of Zwingli, "Baptism is a mere symbol." They rejected all external authority, including that of the Bible, no longer gave heed to aught but the light from within, made no account of their sacramental Baptism, and, as a sign of alliance, gave one another a second baptism. They were called Anabaptists. Due to the zeal of a Swabian tawer, who was an itinerant preacher. Anabaptist doctrines spread in Holland and lower Saxony. Under that gloomy, cloudy sky, favorable to the growth of mystical reverie and social utopias, Anabaptism was not long in assuming a revolutionary form.

John Matthys, or Matthiessen, a baker of Haarlem, became the head of the movement. He organized an effective propaganda and went to Westphalia, where he established polygamy and communism among his followers. This was the kingdom of the "New Sion," which was expected to conquer the world and dispossess all princes except the landgrave of Hesse. When Matthys perished in a sortie against the army of the bishop of Münster, his authority passed into the hands of a Dutch tailor, the young and handsome John Bockold, more generally known as John of Leyden, who made Münster a center of religious and social anarchy. It took no less than a year's siege to regain possession of the city. Finally, on the night of June 24th, 1535, the bishop's troops entered, and executed John of Leyden and his principal officers amidst frightful tortures. Luther, who had fought this compromising sect from the beginning, had reason to rejoice over its ruin. But the spirit of individualism that inspired it did not die with it and was destined in aftertime greatly to trouble the Protestant churches.

No Reunion with Rome

Under the auspices of Pope Paul III, Charles V continued to pursue the work of reunion that he had undertaken. The Pope and the Emperor, in an interview at Bologna (February 24th, 1533), promised each other to do everything to hasten the assembly of a council to restore peace. The Sovereign Pontiff in a kindly letter dated June 2nd to the elector of Saxony, who was Luther's principal supporter, informed him that "the council would be free and universal, in all respects like the ancient assemblies of the Christian Church." [86] A papal lettter (June 2nd, 1536) officially invited all Christian nations to be represented.

Some moderate Protestants, with Melanchthon at their head, tried to persuade their coreligionists to accept the Pope's proposal.[87] But the opinion of the princes, and especially that of Luther, prevailed in the end. Far from accepting the invitation of Paul III, the Protestant princes announced, through Melanchthon, that they rejected the papal offer.[88] The elector of Saxony and the landgrave of Hesse, who were always at the head of the opposition, even proposed an anti-council to be held under the name of "national evangelical council." [89] The next year Luther published, under the title of *Articles of Smalkalden,* a statement in which on several points he clearly departed from the Augsburg Confession. With unheard-of violence he attacked the Mass, "that execrable abomination, that comet drawing in its train the vermin of idolatry," and denounced the Pope as "that Antichrist, that real Satan." [90]

Charles V, however, did not give up hope. At Hagenau, then at Worms, and finally at the diet of Ratisbon (1541), he arranged religious conferences between Catholics and Protestants, with a view to settle the grave dogmatic and disciplinary questions that divided men's minds, as one settles a political question. This was an illusion. No lasting result could come from such conferences. The Ratisbon Interim, which accorded Protestant princes privileges that were canonically inadmissible (such as the power to reform and suppress monasteries within their territory), was rejected even by Luther and remained a dead letter.

The Smalkaldic League was strengthened by new recruits and became more threatening for the Empire. Protestant propaganda conquered new provinces and took on an ever increasing revolutionary aspect. Churches were pillaged, dead bodies exhumed, the sacred Hosts scattered. "Roman idolatries" were everywhere abolished, while the cabarets were filled to overflowing; there was no longer any limit to intemperance and debauchery. "Who of us," said Luther, "would have had the courage to preach the Gospel if he had been able to foresee the calamities, seditions, scandals, blasphemies, ingratitude, and perversity that were to follow our preaching?" [91] And Erasmus wrote: "It seems that the Reformation amounts to defrocking some monks and marrying some priests, and this mighty tragedy has a comic outcome, for everyone is married at last, as in the comedies." [92] In 1540, Philip of Hesse, one of the chief protectors of the Protestant movement, after repudiating his wife, married another with the explicit authorization of Luther and Melanchthon. "What the Mosaic law permitted," said the reformers, "cannot be forbidden by the Gospel." [93]

---

[86] Raynaldi, 1533, nos. 7, 8; Pallavicini, bk. 3, ch. 13.

[87] *Corpus reformatorum,* III, pp. 293, 298, 327.

[88] Pastor, *Reunionsbestrebungen,* p. 93.

[89] Janssen, III, p. 386.

[90] Luther, *Sämmtliche Werke,* XXV, pp. 109–146.

At the request of the elector of Saxony, Luther published (1545) a violent pamphlet entitled, *Against the Papacy Founded at Rome by the Devil.* The coarseness of his abuse surpassed anything that can be imagined. Bossuet says of it: "Let one of his most partial disciples take the trouble to read this discourse which he composed against the papacy, in the time of Paul III, I am certain he would blush for Luther. He will there find throughout the whole, I do not say so much fury and transport, but such wretched puns, such low jests, and such filthiness of the basest kind, as is not heard but from the mouths of the most despicable of mankind. 'The pope,' says he, 'is so full of devils, that he spits them and blows them from his nose.' Let us not finish what Luther was not ashamed to repeat thirty times."[94] Upon reading this little book, many of Luther's contemporaries thought that he had become either insane or was possessed by the devil.[95]

---

[91] Janssen, III, p. 592. Cf. De Wette, II, p. 107, and the texts quoted by Döllinger, *La Réforme,* III, p. 195.

[92] Erasmus, *Epistolae,* bk. 19, ep. 3.

[93] On the bigamy of the landgrave of Hesse and its approval by Luther, see Janssen (III, pp. 449–458), Denifle (*Luther and Lutherdom,* pp. 127 sqq.), and the Protestant Bezold, who considers this incident "the blackest spot of the Reformation" (*Geschichte der deutschen Reformation,* p. 795.) In authorizing this case of bigamy, the leader of the Reformation was quite in keeping with the principles which he proclaimed in a sermon in 1522: "If they are stubborn [he is speaking of wives], it is fitting their husbands should tell them, if you will not, another will: if the mistress refuse to come, let the maid be called." (Quoted by Bossuet, *Variations,* bk. 6, sec. 11.)

Toward the end of July, 1545, Luther expressed a desire to quit Wittenberg, to flee from the society of his friends, and to wander about begging his bread.[96] Seven months later, having gone to Mansfeld to arbitrate a dispute between the counts of Mansfeld relative to some copper mines, he felt himself growing weak. In fact, he was physically and morally exhausted. He breathed his last during the night of February 18th, 1546.[97]

This pretended reformer and veritable revolutionist left trouble and disunion everywhere, in the institutions of the time as well as in the souls of men. Such a result was not due solely to the violence of Luther's character and the faults of his followers. It also proceeded from a vice deeply rooted in his teaching. Luther had at first wished to free himself from all authority, to acknowledge no criterion of truth but private interpretation of Scripture; but soon after, alarmed by the anarchy of his work, he sought to impose fundamental dogmas on it. Protestant historians, such as Adolph von

---

[94] *Sämmtliche Werke,* XXVI, pp. 108–228; Bossuet, *Variations,* bk. 1, sec. 33.

[95] Janssen, II, p. 590.

[96] Burkardt, *Luthers Briefwechsel,* p. 475.

[97] Majunke maintains that Luther ended his own life by hanging. But his arguments are not convincing. See Paulus, *Luthers Lebensende und der Eislebener Apotheker Johann Landau; Luthers Lebensende;* Janssen-Pastor, *History of the German People after the Close of the Middle Ages,* VI, p. 281.

Harnack, have recognized the existence of this dissolving dualism in Luther's doctrine.[98]

Dogmatic Syncretism and Individualistic Pietism

After the death of its founder, the Protestant Revolt split into two dissident parts: some of its members labored to hold it together by coming to an agreement on a common fund of beliefs; the others, leaving to each one's individual conscience the care of formulating a symbol, sought merely to cultivate sentimental piety: these are the two movements which have been called dogmatic syncretism and individualistic pietism.

Dogmatic syncretism, which first took shape in the Augsburg Confession (1530), attempted to organize itself, during the latter half of the sixteenth century, under the direction of the German rulers. The Augsburg Interim, which in 1548 tried to come as near as possible to Luther's doctrine, the Religious Peace of Augsburg, which in 1555 granted to each ruler the *jus reformandi, i. e.,* the right to determine what religion was to be practised by his subjects, the Heidelberg Catechism, which in 1563 undertook to establish the religious union of all Protestant countries of Germany upon a Calvinist symbol,[99] and the Formula of Concord (1580), which was an effort "to place a definite seal on Luther's work,[100] mark the principal stages in the history of dogmatic syncretism in the sixteenth century.

---

[98] Harnack, *Outlines of the History of Dogma,* bk. 3, chap. 4. Auguste Sabatier, dean of the Protestant theological faculty of Paris, writing in the *Journal de Genève,* May 5th, 1896, says: "Protestantism suffers from an internal antinomy that is derived from its very principle . . . If you have no confession of faith, who are you? What society do you form? Why do you exist? And if you promulgate a profession of faith, and wish to impose it on me with authority and in spite of the resistance of my conscience, how are you still a Protestant? What are you doing other than what is done by Catholicism, against which you say that Luther and Calvin did well to revolt?" Henri Hauser (*Études sur la Réforme française,* p. 63) says: "Calvin did not see, or was unwilling to see, the startling antinomy in the very foundation of his work: to reëstablish an authority, a dogma, a church, with private judgment as a starting-point." See this objection eloquently set forth in Rousseau's *Deuxième lettre de la montagne* and in Lessing's *Anti-Göze.*

[99] Janssen, IV, p. 205.

Individualistic pietism, which found its first expression in the Anabaptist movement, had to wait for its full development until the seventeenth century, under the impulse of Philip Jacob Spener; but Caspar Schwenkfeld (d. 1561), Valentin Weigel (d. 1588), and Jacob Böhme (d. 1624) were its precursors.

Caspar Schwenkfeld, born at Ossig in Silesia, was at first an enthusiastic disciple of Luther; but the desperate dryness of the Lutheran doctrine, no less than the tyrannical measures of the reformer, soon repelled his pious soul. He turned against his teacher, accused him of being the slave of a dead letter and wishing to destroy the wheat along with the cockle. For Schwenkfeld, internal piety was everything; he regarded external organization and dogmatic formulas as in themselves indifferent and of worth only as indirect means of stirring up faith and love. Word and sign speak to the carnal man; the Spirit of God alone acts on the spiritual man, producing grace in him and rendering his soul capable of hearing the word from without. The most expressive symbol of this vivifying action of God in souls is the Sacrament of the Eucharist, which is purely a ceremony and, as a figure, singularly striking and effective. Schwenkfeld's Christology was a sort of Eutychianism: Christ's flesh, according to him, was indeed human flesh, but so penetrated by grace from the very beginning, and transfigured in such wise by the Resurrection, that it was completely divinized, it was God Himself. Whosoever believed these things and lived by them, to whatever sect he belonged, was predestined for Heaven, and the society of the predestined formed the true and only Church.[101]

---

[100] Preface of the *Formula Concordiae.*

[101] Cf. Döllinger, *La Réforme,* I, pp. 229-268.

Schwenkfeld preached his doctrine at Wittenberg, Augsburg, Ulm, Tübingen, and Strasburg. As he was opposed by both the Lutherans and the Catholics, he was unable to establish a numerous church, but communicated his faith to some devoted and enthusiastic followers, who conserved his doctrine and spread it after his death.

In the second half of the sixteenth century, a Protestant pastor of Saxony, Valentin Weigel, gathered about him a large number of men who, dissatisfied with the withering dogmas of official Protestantism and with its tyrannical organization, aspired to an interior life free from all hindrances. Nourished on the works of Master Eckhart, Tauler, Carlstadt, and Schwenkfeld, fusing the views of the pseudo-Areopagite with the "Deutsch Theologia," Valentin Weigel taught that the internal light suffices for all the religious needs of the soul; what comes from without can only disturb it. From the celebrated physician Paracelsus[102] he borrowed the idea that the operation of grace in the soul is quite similar to that of God in nature. And hence chemistry can furnish a solution of the problems of the soul. Weigel was something of a Gnostic and an alchemist.

At the beginning of the seventeenth century we meet a sort of synthesis of Schwenkfeld's and Weigel's pietism in the writings of the shoemaker-philosopher Jacob Böhme, who professed to obtain all his internal revelations from personal intuition and who attempted to explain his mysticism by colors, sounds, physical and chemical phenomena. He insisted, more than did his predecessors, on dying to oneself in order to live in God, and he tried to establish his religious system on ontological principles. Böhme's works, translated into French by Claude de Saint-Martin (*"le philosophe inconnu"*), founder of the sect of Martinists, exercised a real influence, not only in Germany and France, but also in England.[103]

---

[102] Theophrastus Bombastus von Hohenheim (1493–1541), a Swiss physician, in his writings took the name Aureolus Theophrastus Paracelsus. After maintaining most extravagant doctrines, he died a Catholic.

Such were the fruits of Protestantism in Germany at the end of the sixteenth century.

A strange doctrine of justification, invented by a monk who had no religious vocation, to soothe his anguished conscience, was preached with passionate eloquence and agitated men's minds, already so gravely disturbed by humanism; then, thanks to the general discontent resulting from the economic perturbations of the time, the anarchy of rulers and abuses among the clergy, civil war broke out. However, the Lutheran dogma, by its innate inconsistency, dissolved of its own accord and gave birth to a thousand sects that devoured one another, and the social condition of Germany grew daily worse. Once more history shows that heresy, so powerful in destroying, is incapable of building up.

---

[103] On Jacob Böhme, see Boutroux, *Historical Studies in Philosophy,* one chapter of which (pp. 169–233) is entitled "Jacob Boehme, the German Philosopher." This study is quite sympathetic to the shoemaker who was a philosopher and mystic.

CHAPTER IV

Protestantism in England

When, in 1521, King Henry VIII fought Luther's errors so vigorously that he received from the Pope the glorious title of "Defender of the Faith," a superficial observer could not have foreseen that this same king would provoke a more radical and complete separation between the Roman Church and England, than that which reigned in Germany; that, under favor of this separation, his son Edward VI would allow Lutheranism to penetrate into Great Britain; and that his daughter Elizabeth would organize a most effective and cruel persecution against Catholics. Starting out with the denial of an essential dogma, Luther finally engaged in a violent war against Rome; beginning by a rupture with the Holy See, the English monarchy finally established the Anglican heresy: so true is it that all heresy leads to schism and that all schism paves the way for a heresy, the purity of the faith and obedience to the hierarchy being indissolubly bound together in the Church of Christ.

Precursors

The germs of schism and heresy that were troubling the continent since the fourteenth century existed also in Great Britain. At the origin of the two movements which most deeply shook the institutions of the Middle Ages, that of the legists and that of the heterodox teachers, we met two Englishmen, William of Occam and John Wyclif. The false mystics who were agitating Germany and France would have regarded as brothers the Lollards who, at the close of the fourteenth century, were posting on church doors placards defamatory of the clergy and preaching doctrines closely resembling those of the most advanced collectivists of our day.[1] In the fifteenth century the combined efforts of the pope and king dispersed them and seemingly suppressed their teaching; but their spirit survived and became one of the most effective elements of the Anglican schism.

Nowhere was the spirit of national egoism, which had ruptured the unity of Christendom, more alive than in England at this time. The new British aristocracy, born in commerce and finance, penetrated with a utilitarian spirit, incapable of rising to the generous heroism of the crusaders of former times, and ruined by the War of the Roses, looked with envious eyes upon the rich possessions of the upper clergy. King Henry VII, after the union of the two Roses in his own person had been sanctioned by the pope, created an absolute monarchy and kept the episcopate under his hand. The appointment of bishops belonged of right to the chapters, but in fact depended on the king, who used pressure on the chapters and rewarded the most competent prelates by appointment as legal councillors, ambassadors, and ministers of state. Simple priests and other clerics were deprived of the "privilege of clergy" and subject to trial by the royal courts. The rank and file of the nation distrusted the pope. It was feared that the Holy See had become dependent on the emperor of Germany, as it was dependent on the king of France during the Western Schism. Already in 1426, Pope Martin V complained that the king of England had "usurped spiritual jurisdiction as absolutely as if our Lord had appointed him His vicar." Since then the evil had grown much worse.

---

[1] On Wyclif and the Lollards, see Lechler, *John Wiclif and his English Precursors;* Trevelyan, *England in the Age of Wycliffe.* The name Wyclif is variously spelled by historians. On the relation of the Lollards to the Reformation, see Gairdner, *Lollardy and the Reformation in England.*

John Colet, a priest of great erudition, born at London in 1467, but trained in the culture of humanism by Florentine teachers, brought back to his country the spirit of the Renaissance, explained the Bible without having recourse to the Scholastic doctors, and developed reformatory ideas borrowed from Savonarola. Colet, Erasmus, and More soon formed what was later called the Oxford reform school. It was at the house of Thomas More in London that Erasmus wrote (1511) his *Praise of Folly,* wherein, while not attacking any dogmas of the Church, he ridiculed monks, Scholastic theologians, the popes, the veneration of images, the use of relics, and the practice of indulgences. Thomas More himself, sturdy Christian though he was, in his *Utopia* (1516) played with the strangest paradoxes and went so far as to require that "priests in the Utopian kingdom" be elected by secret ballot and that all religions should take part in the same public worship held in the same temple. All this was, of course, a matter of witty trifling; but with the reading of these literary fancies, new ideas fermented, men's heads became overheated, and Thomas More himself became the victim of a revolution which his Utopia may have helped to foment.

Henry VIII, Defender of the Faith

The accession of the brilliant and popular Henry VIII to the British throne in 1509 could not but accentuate the movement of national autonomy and literary culture which we have already noted. The young King had reached his eighteenth year. His youth, beauty, and gracefulness won all hearts. The Venetian ambassador, about 1510, said: "His Majesty is the most charming prince our eyes have ever beheld." At the Field of the Cloth of Gold, in 1520, the French found him "tall and straight, the handsomest prince who ever governed England." In 1517 Chieregati wrote to Isabella d'Este: "To my mind Henry surpasses all those who have ever worn a crown. The country may well be called happy and blessed that possesses so worthy a lord and so perfect a sovereign." He was a good musician, an excellent horseman, remarkably skilful in manly sports, and could fluently converse in Latin, French, and Spanish. Every day he heard three masses, sometimes five. In addition to this, he was present at the divine office, *i. e.,* vespers and compline;[2] but the evenings he passed in masquerades, comedies, games, and various diversions. From a prince so assiduous at the services of the Church and at the same time so given to worldly amusements, one might expect a strange policy. Henry applied himself to combine the satisfaction of his sensual passions and his mania for dominance in religious matters with that exclusively national and utilitarian policy which was a tradition left him by his father and to which the general tendency of his people urged him.

Upon his coming to the throne, Henry VIII found the English policy orientated from the Spanish point of view and consequently allied to the pope's cause and directed against France. His marriage to Catherine of Aragon, the daughter of Ferdinand, which was negotiated in 1503 by his father, Henry VII, was calculated to set the seal on that national policy; but it was only after some opposition that the young prince finally accepted a union that had been decided upon without consulting him.

His taste for religious controversy found its gratification in the alliance with the Holy See. In 1514, Leo X, just elected, made him a present of cap and sword. In 1518, at the first reports of Luther's revolt, the royal theologian wrote a dogmatic treatise, now lost, on the subject of vocal prayer.[3] In 1521, after the condemnation of Lutheranism by the Bull

---

[2] *Calendar of State Papers, Venetian,* II, no. 1287, p. 559.

[3] Erasmus, *Epistolae,* bk. 6, ep. 12; bk. 19, ep. 107.

"Exsurge," he published a more lengthy and pretentious work on the theology of the Sacraments.[4] A papal Bull conferred on the King the title of "Defender of the Faith." His pride in this title and the flattering praise that went so far as to call him "Luther's most formidable adversary," gave the King a haughty confidence in his theological knowledge, an immoderate desire to govern his kingdom in spirituals as well as in temporals, and a disdainful attitude towards churchmen.

The repression of heresy was his first care. The sect of the Lollards was dissolved. Although many a bold opinion was uttered, yet formal heresies were rare. Nevertheless, from 1509 to 1522, two heretics were sent to the stake in the diocese of London. A carpenter, James Brewster, arrested in 1505 for having spoken ill of pilgrimages, images, and the Sacrament of the Altar, was condemned to be burned. William Sweeting, a shepherd, arrested for like reasons, and especially for having denied transubstantiation, mounted the same scaffold as Brewster (October 18th, 1511). Among thirty-seven accused men who were set at liberty after retracting their errors, one had maintained that there were six gods, another that St. Paul's church was a den of robbers, a third that the clergy were too rich, a fourth that there were too many holydays.[5]

Divorce of Henry VIII

An incident that was purely personal with the English King was destined to produce a national schism. Catherine of Aragon, whom Henry VIII had married immediately after ascending the throne in 1509, had been married eight years before to the King's elder brother, Arthur. This prince, not yet fourteen years old and in feeble health, died a year later. The marriage had never been consummated. Nevertheless it was necessary to obtain from Pope Julius II a dispensation from the first degree of affinity in order to celebrate Catherine's second marriage. But, a few years after this, the frivolous monarch fell in love with a young Irish maiden, formerly lady-in-waiting to Princess Margaret of Navarre, but at that time in the suite of Queen Catherine. Political motives were added to Henry's passionate desire. He had no hope of a male heir to the crown.[6] Emperor Charles V, by refusing the hand of the young Princess Mary, which Henry VIII offered him, and by releasing Francis I after Pavia, had annihilated the ambitious projects of the English monarch, who was hopeful, with the Emperor's help, of winning the French crown for himself. His vengeance would be to divorce Catherine, the Emperor's aunt; the matrimonial rupture would accentuate the diplomatic rupture. But a reason had to be found; the royal theologian and his councillors alleged no less than three: it was doubtful, they said, whether the pope could permit one to marry one's brother's widow;[7] they added that the Bull of Julius II was null and void because it had been obtained by false pretences; and after all, the eminent services of the King of England to the Church deserved a special privilege, if he had need of such. They asked that at least the case should be tried in England and that it should be entrusted to the chancellor of the realm, Thomas Wolsey, cardinal and archbishop of York. In 1519, Giustiniani, the Venetian ambassador, spoke of this prelate as "very handsome, learned, remarkably eloquent, prodigiously capable, and indefatigable." On Giustiniani's first arrival in England, Wolsey used to say to him, "His Majesty will do so and so." Subsequently, by degrees, he forgot himself and said, "We shall do so and so." Finally, he reached such a pitch that he used to say, "I shall do so and so."[8] Thomas Wolsey was the type of those worldly prelates that we meet with so often in the decadence of the Middle Ages; in him the statesman supplanted the priest; reasons of state were almost everything to him, and justice was a matter of little account. He was gifted with keen perspicacity in political matters and even foretold the maritime future of England; but as he was no less attached to his own personal interests than to those of his country, he did not fear to play a double game between Francis I and Charles V in order to reach the papacy. In the matter of the King's marriage, Wolsey was the first to suggest a divorce. He hoped to have the solution of the question confided to him and expected to solve it in favor of his scheming policy.

---

[4] The title is *Assertio septem sacramentorum.* Its doctrine is faultless. Cardinal Fisher is reputed to have collaborated in this work.

[5] Trésal, *Les origines du schisme anglican,* p. 37.

---

[6] The recent study of new archival documents has led some to think that this political consideration was the prime motive of the divorce. In 1525, two years before the divorce, Henry was contemplating a plan to bestow the royal succession on a natural son by Elizabeth Blount. As early as 1514, we find a Venetian writing from Rome: "It is said that the King of England is thinking of repudiating his wife because he can have no children of her." In 1525 the English ambassadors were commissioned to negotiate a marriage of the King with a niece of the Emperor. (See Constant, *Le divorce d'Henri VIII et le schisme anglican,* in the *Revue Hebdomadaire,* September 4th, 1909). It is none the less true that Henry's passion for Anne Boleyn became the determining motive for his rupture with the Pope, whose authority was in the way of Henry's designs and was the unyielding defender not only of Christian morals, but also of the monks, whose property the King coveted in order to bestow it on personages of his realm in exchange for their lost liberties. We must, moreover, recognize that, if England so promptly complied with the new order of things, it was because of the slow but deep transformation which the English people had undergone under the influence of Lollard preaching, the introduction of printing, great discoveries, and the notable commercial changes that ensued.

Catherine of Aragon, whose calm dignity won her the sympathy of unprejudiced minds, appealed to the Pope. The

---

[7] Some medieval theologians had asked this same question. See, for instance, Pierre de la Palud, *Com. in sent.*, IV dist. XL, a. 3, 3a concl. But there can be no doubt about its solution in the affirmative. (See Bossuet, *Variations*, bk. 7, sec. 50–62.)

[8] *Calendar of State Papers, Venetian*, II, no. 1287, p. 560.

Holy See was then occupied by Clement VII, who was embroiled with the Spaniards and exposed to the attacks of Italian factions, and had retired to Orvieto, where he lived in poverty, abandoned by all. Clement's profound circumspection in delicate matters and his great ability in solving difficult problems were everywhere admired; but, as Ranke remarks, "there is a practical and inventive faculty by which some men intuitively perceive the simple and practicable in affairs, and, guided by this, they rapidly seize on the best expedient. This he did not possess." [9]

It has been said that a Gregory VII would have cut the knotty problem by a single stroke. But we would not venture to pass so absolute a judgment on Clement's conduct. He purposed first to treat gently this prince who had shown himself so formidable an adversary of Luther. The Pope's tactics aimed at gaining time. He hoped that the King's passion for Anne Boleyn would sooner or later grow cool. Passion, however, was not Henry's only motive; there was also a policy of national interest, in the narrow sense of the term; there was, finally, a tenacious pride. Besides, the Pope could not foresee that soon two perfidious councillors would make themselves the tools of the King's passion, policy, and pride. In a Bull (June, 1528), which was intended to be kept secret and which has not come down to us, Clement VII solved in principle, it seems, the question of Henry VIII's marriage in favor of the King and instructed his legate Campeggio, along with Wolsey, to pass a definitive judgment on the case.

Queen Catherine was a superior woman with a broad and deep intellectual culture; she had received lessons from Erasmus. But the people had been drawn to her especially by her goodness. She was acclaimed whenever she appeared in the streets. Campeggio, on the contrary, was hissed because it was supposed he had been commissioned to decide the case against her. In reality, the legate had received secret instructions to drag out the case. "Time solves all difficulties," say the Italians. It was hoped that Henry might adopt the suggestion to introduce a new petition. The King had, indeed, entertained the idea of obtaining a dispensation from bigamy in order to marry Anne. The expedient would have failed; but to let the matter be introduced on this new basis would have been to gain time.

---

[9] Ranke, I, p. 80.

This delay unfortunately permitted two unscrupulous Englishmen to play a fatal part in the drama—Thomas Cranmer and Thomas Cromwell. The King, during a journey made in August, 1529, stopped at the abbey of Watham and there met a young priest, a tutor at Cambridge University, whose ideas pleased him greatly. This priest maintained that, if a declaration in favor of the royal divorce were obtained from a certain number of universities, the King could, with a safe conscience, consider his marriage as null and void. He also gave the King to understand that he would gladly undertake to procure the desired declarations. His name was Thomas Cranmer. His life and character designated him as fit to become the principal agent of a schism. He had violated the most solemn engagement of his priesthood by marrying and thereby lost his post as a fellow, which was subsequently restored to him on the death of her whom he had made the companion of his sacrilege. Later on he secretly married the daughter of the celebrated Lutheran pastor Osiander, and it seems that at the time the King met him he was already attached to Luther's doctrine. The King asked him for a memorandum on the question of the divorce and on the means of carrying out the project which he contemplated. This was the beginning of the prodigious fortune of the poor tutor, who was consecrated archbishop of Canterbury in 1533.

The favor accorded to Cranmer coincided with the disgrace of Wolsey. The King and Anne Boleyn attributed the failure of the divorce case to the Cardinal's negligence or incapacity. On October 29th, 1629, Wolsey was the object of a bill of *Praemunire,*[10] for having exercised the functions of papal legate in England. In November an accusation of high treason was preferred against him. About a year later (November 29th, 1530) he died of grief in a monastery at Leicester. His last words were these: "If I had served God as diligently as I have done the King, he would not have given me over in my gray hairs." [11]

Shortly after Wolsey's death, Thomas Cromwell, an attorney in the Cardinal's service, having a complaint to offer because of an insult received from some nobleman, obtained an audience with the King. As related in a report by Charles V's ambassador to the English court, "the lawyer Cromwell addressed the King in such flattering terms and with such eloquence, promising to make him the richest sovereign in the world, that the King at once took him into his service and made him a councillor, although his appointment was kept secret for four months." [12] According to the same authority, Cromwell, the son of a poor blacksmith, had led a rather irregular and dissipated life in his youth. After some time spent in prison, he travelled in Flanders and Italy, married a fuller's daughter, and for a while directed the workmen in his father-in-law's shop; then he entered the service of Cardinal

---

[10] According to Trésal, "*Praemunire,* a corruption of the Latin *praemonere,* the opening word of an order by which a magistrate summoned a citizen to answer a charge of violating the statutes or laws which, beginning in the fourteenth century, aimed at preventing encroachments of ecclesiastical jurisdiction upon civil jurisdiction. The laws of *praemunire* forbade papal legates to enter England or to exercise their office therein without royal sanction; they forbade appointments to English benefices by the Holy See, etc. As their phrasing was vague and obscure, they constituted a terrible weapon in the hands of a tyrant." (Trésal, p. 58.)

[11] Cavendish, *Life of Wolsey,* p. 271.

[12] *Letters and Papers of Henry VIII,* IV, no. 6391, p. 2869.

Wolsey, who had divined the resources of that active and enterprising spirit.[13]

Cranmer and Cromwell, in the high station to which Henry VIII elevated them, became the most powerful agents of the schism. Cranmer, by collecting the testimony of the universities in favor of the royal divorce, and Cromwell, by laboring to subject the clergy to the spiritual authority of the King, both of them by secretly favoring the Lutheran heresy, prepared the ground for the rupture between England and the Holy See. Cranmer consummated the work under Edward VI.

Promises, threats, bribes, violence, nothing was spared to obtain an opinion from Cambridge University in favor of the King's divorce. Finally the two most energetic opponents were ejected from the hall where the deliberations were being held; the others voted in conformity with the will of the King.[14] From the Sorbonne a favorable though irregular decision was obtained by means of pressure on the French government. Agents, well provided with gold, approached the doctors of Padua and were able to bring back an opinion in accord with Henry's desires. It is said that Cranmer's secret marriage took place while he was in Germany recruiting votes.[15]

The King Proclaimed Supreme Head of the Church

To suppress the monasteries, intimidate the clergy, and force them under the jurisdiction of the King, who was proclaimed "supreme head of the Church," was the work of Thomas Cromwell. If Wolsey could be declared guilty of having violated the statute of *Praemunire* by accepting the office of papal legate, did not the bishops and abbots who took an oath of allegiance to the bishop of Rome fall logically under the same prohibition and incur the same penalties? Besides, did not that obedience of the clergy to the sovereign pontiff create a troublesome dualism in the realm, did it not make of England a two-headed monster? Such arguments, ably presented by Cromwell, touched the King. They also moved Parliament, where the King's royal projects had encountered no serious opposition.

---

[13] *Ibid.*

[14] Trésal, p. 64.

[15] Bossuet (*Variations,* bk. 7, sec. 9) speaks of the sister of Osiander.

The clergy, terrified by Cromwell's procedure and threats, voted 100,000 pounds sterling as a fine for a crime which they had not committed; on February 11th, 1531, the two ecclesiastical chambers passed five articles, the first two of which read as follows: (1) "We recognize that His Majesty is the special protector, the sole and supreme lord, and, so far as the law of Christ allows, the supreme head of the Church and clergy of England."[16] (2) "The care of souls will be entrusted to His Majesty."

The Spanish ambassador at London wrote on February 14th: "The English clergy have been induced and compelled to declare, constitute, and accept the king as the chief and principal head of the whole Anglican Church, which amounts almost to making him pope in England."[17] A week later he wrote: "Anne Boleyn and her father, too, have been the principal promoters of this measure (the King assuming the sovereignty of the Church in England). No one except perhaps a few who have taken part in this affair approve of such a step as this. . . . The chancellor himself is so horrified at it that he wishes to quit office as soon as possible. The Bishop of Rochester [Fisher] is quite ill in consequence."[18]

---

[16] The words, "so far as the law of Christ allows," were added at Fisher's request. They attenuated, but did not remove, the odious character of the declaration. (See Kerker, *Vie de Fisher*, p. 202.)

[17] *Calendar of State Papers, Spanish*, IV, part 2, pp. 63, 71.

[18] *Ibid.*, p. 641.

The future showed how well-founded were these apprehensions. The amendment which was voted at Fisher's request—"so far as the law of Christ allows"—was practically taken no account of. Who of those prelates, appointed by the Crown and more subject to the King than to the Pope, would have dared to oppose the sovereign as to the meaning of this reservation?

In March, 1532, the King had the House of Lords and the House of Commons pass a bill abolishing the annates: on May 10th he forced the clergy to "offer and promise" that they would "never from henceforth enact, put in, promulgate, or execute any new canons or constitutions or any other new ordinance" without royal authorization.[19] It was a question of ecclesiastical laws and constitutions. The very day this declaration was passed, Sir Thomas More resigned from the office of chancellor. Bishop Fisher, who had been the victim of a mysterious attempt to poison him, left London. On May 13th Ambassador Chappuys wrote to his sovereign: "Churchmen will be of less account than shoemakers, who have the power of assembling and making their own statutes." [20]

The Schism Accomplished

When the Pope's decision, declaring the validity of Henry's first marriage, was solemnly promulgated (March 23rd, 1533), the schism was accomplished both in fact and in law. Three great laws, passed at the beginning of 1534, consummated the separation. The first of these, regarding the pope as a foreign bishop, whose decisions, even in matters of dogma or morals, counted for nothing in England, regulated the appointment of bishops: the king was to nominate a candidate of his own choice; "permission to elect" was granted to the chapter for twelve days; at the end of that period, the appointment would be made directly by the king. The new bishop would take an oath of obedience to the king alone. The second great law abolished Peter's pence and all other contributions that had been established in favor of Rome. The third suppressed the right of appeal to Rome and subjected all episcopal ordinances to the king.

---

[19] In Gee and Hardy, *Documents Illustrative of English Church History,* p. 177.

[20] *Letters and Papers of Henry VIII,* V, no. 1013, p. 467.

Meanwhile Cranmer's authority had been increasing. At the beginning of 1533 he was appointed archbishop of Canterbury and took the oath required by the Pope, but only after declaring in writing that this oath was simply a formality and could nowise restrict his freedom of action. By virtue of a power granted him by the King, he proclaimed (May 23rd) the nullity of the marital union between Henry VIII and Catherine of Aragon. Five days later he declared as valid the secret marriage which the King affirmed he had contracted with Anne Boleyn on January 25th preceding. On June 1st, he solemnly crowned the new queen, who on September 7th gave birth to a child who was to become Queen Elizabeth. Charles V's ambassador wrote: "It all seems a dream, and even those who take part in these feasts know not whether they should laugh or cry."

The King's new marriage was criticized by some priests; Cranmer forbade them to preach for a year. A Franciscan preacher defended the validity of the King's first union; they threatened to throw him into the Thames. But the son of St. Francis replied: "Do so; I am quite sure that one can go to heaven by water as well as by land." However rare these symptoms of resistance were, they had to be crushed. Cranmer made a visitation of his province and forced on his clergy a declaration that "the bishop of Rome has not received from God any greater authority over the English realm than any other foreign bishop." From two assemblies of the clergy the following perfidious declaration was obtained: *"According to Scripture* the pope has no more authority in England than any other bishop and there is nothing *in Scripture* regulating the relations between Rome and England." As it is quite clear that Scripture never formally and directly spoke of England, many thought they could accept this text with a safe conscience; others no doubt were glad to shield themselves by an equivocation. Two monks there were who did not blush to distribute in the monasteries another form of oath, more explicitly in favor of the King. This was a perfidious trick: they counted on a refusal *en masse,* which would permit a general dissolution of the religious Orders. The Franciscans of the strict observance, the monks of the Augustinian abbey of Sion, and those of Charterhouse at London were the only ones to offer a unanimous and energetic resistance. Several, however, in the end, took the oath with the restriction: "So far as the law of God permits."

Thomas Cromwell, who had been only a layman, was appointed (January, 1535) vicar general of the King for all ecclesiastical affairs, with authority to make a visitation of the churches, monasteries, and hospitals, to issue ordinances, to try the clergy and religious, and to give investiture to bishops. "Till then," says Bossuet, "that title had not been met with on the list of the Crown officers of England, nor among the employments recorded in the review of the empire, nor in any Christian kingdom whatsoever; and it was Henry VIII that first showed England and the Christian world, a lord vicegerent and a king's vicar general in spirituals." [21]

The papal act of March 23rd, 1533, deciding the divorce case against the King, excommunicated Henry VIII, Anne Boleyn, and Cranmer. But the thunders of Rome could no longer frighten the King and his councillors, who took their

[21] Bossuet, *Variations,* bk. 7, sec. 4.

stand on purely national ground. What secular power would dare to execute the Pope's sentence? The Emperor, although Henry VIII's attitude shocked his Catholic faith and the divorce touched his aunt's honor, did not even wish to recall his ambassador from London, lest Francis I would come to an understanding with Henry to take Flanders from him. The attitude of Francis was full of hesitation: the eight French cardinals left the Eternal City just when the consistory was about to make its decision in the case of Henry's divorce. In the conflict between their conscientious duty and the interests of their sovereign, who did not want to do anything in opposition to the desire of King Henry VIII, they simply preferred to abstain from any participation. The days of the crusades were decidedly past: the care of political and commercial interests had taken the place of chivalry.

Almost the only protest left was that of the popular conscience. "On Easter Sunday (April 13th, 1534) the prior of the Augustinians, preaching at St. Paul's, invoked heaven's blessing on the new Queen. At once a great tumult arose in the church and the people left as a mark of protest. Like scenes took place in most of the country churches and, in many parishes, for several months no notice was taken of the royal orders prescribing prayers for Anne. Capello, the Venetian envoy, wrote (June 3rd, 1535): "The King is very unpopular; a rebellion could easily break out any day and cause great disorder." [22]

Cromwell and Cranmer, political tricksters that they were, had tried, the year before, to terrify the people by an execution that received wide publicity. Elizabeth Barton, a farm servant, predisposed to religious monomania by some nervous disease, had supposed visions and ecstasies in which she spoke forcibly against the King's divorce and the errors of the times. The "Holy Maid of Kent," as she was called, used often to go to a chapel which, from 1528 to 1534, became a sort of pilgrimage place, the rendezvous of a certain number of people faithful to Catherine of Aragon. Cranmer made an investigation, following which he claimed to have discovered in a vast plot the whole party opposed to his policy, including Chancellor Thomas More, Bishop Fisher, the Marchioness of Exeter, the Countess of Salisbury, and Queen Catherine herself. Elizabeth Barton was executed (April 20th, 1534). This was the first blood shed during the religious discords in England. Nobler victims were soon to fall beneath the executioner's axe.

---

[22] Trésal, p. 122.

An "oath of supremacy" had been imposed on all ecclesiastics, obliging them to recognize the King as the source of all spiritual power, and an "oath of succession" forced the faithful to acknowledge the daughter of Anne Boleyn as the only legitimate heir to the throne. The famous "treason laws" completed these prescriptions and added terrible penalties thereto. All persons are adjudged traitors who "maliciously wish, will, or desire by words or writing, or by craft imagine, invent, practice, or attempt, any bodily harm to be done or committed to the King's most royal person, the Queen's, or their heirs apparent, or to deprive them or any of them of the dignity, title, or name of their royal estates, or slanderously and maliciously publish and pronounce, by express writing or words, that the King our Sovereign Lord should be heretic, schismatic, tyrant, infidel, or usurper of the Crown." [23] This was the "English Terror." "In 1535 Charterhouse and Sion," says Denis,[24] "supplied contingents of martyrs, fettered at Newgate, hanged and quartered at Tyburn. The horrors of 1536 exceeded those of the year before. The time had come when every Englishman, under pain of death, was obliged, like Shakespeare's King John, to spit on the papacy."[25]

---

[23] *Statutes of the Realm, Henry VIII,* A. D. 1534, III, p. 508.

[24] Ernest Denis in Lavisse and Rambaud, IV, pp. 571–579.

On May 4th, 1535, three Carthusian monks (John Houghton, Robert Lawrence, and Augustine Webster), a Brigittine (Richard Reynolds), and an aged pastor of Isleworth (John Hale), accused of having violated the "treason laws," were stretched on wooden hurdles, their feet tied together, and were dragged through the streets. Following this torture, they were hanged on a gibbet; then, as the law obliged their agony to be prolonged, they were let down at the first signs of strangulation; finally their entrails were cut out piece by piece, and their entire heart at one stroke.[26]

Fisher and More

All the bishops yielded except Fisher, all the jurists except More. Fisher and More, the two greatest men in England, did not escape the block. Their death was as noble as their life. To narrate, even without comment, the last hours of these two martyrs of the Catholic faith, is the greatest homage that history can pay their memory, the Church for which they died, and the country which they adorned.[27]

Fisher was accused of having said: "The King, our sovereign lord, is not supreme head on earth of the Church in England." He appeared before a special commission (June 12th, 1535). So weakened was he by sickness that he could scarcely stand. Turning to the advocate general, the Bishop said: "Mr. Rich, I cannot but marvel to hear you come in and bear witness against me of these words. . . . This man came to me from the King (as he said) on a secret message, with commendations from His Grace. . . . Yet he told me that the King, for better satisfaction of his conscience, had sent him unto me in this secret manner, to know my full opinion in the matter. . . . He told me that the King willed him to assure me on his honor, and on the word of a king, that whatsoever I should say to him by this his secret messenger, I should abide no danger or peril for it." Rich offered no denial of Fisher's assertion. Nevertheless the Bishop was condemned to death. The King merely exempted him from the usual tortures; he was simply decapitated.

---

[25] "Thou canst not, Cardinal, devise a name
So slight, unworthy and ridiculous
To charge me to an answer, as the pope."
(King John, Act III, scene 1.)

[26] *Letters and Papers of Henry VIII,* VIII, no. 726, p. 272.

[27] See Leclercq, *Les martyrs,* VII, pp. 38–161.

When the Bishop reached the foot of the scaffold, he motioned his guards aside as they wished to help him ascend, and climbed up the ladder with a spryness that astonished those who knew his weakened condition. When he reached the platform, he said in a strong voice: "Christian people, I am come here to die for the faith of Christ's holy Catholic Church, and I thank God . . . I beseech Almighty God of His infinite goodness to save the King and this realm." He knelt down, prayed for a moment, and then laid his head on the block. A single stroke of the axe severed it from the trunk. His head remained exposed on London Bridge for several days and was then thrown into the river. Its place on the bridge was soon taken by that of the chancellor, Thomas More.[28]

By his domestic virtues, his sprightly humor, his lofty culture, and his independence of mind, Thomas More was one of the most attractive figures of the Renaissance. His last days revealed the deep religious sentiments of his soul. Among other accusations, advocate general Rich, as in the case of Fisher, charged him with certain words that were uttered in a private conversation into which he had been tricked. Rich also distorted the meaning of the words. With stately and indignant eloquence, the former chancellor showed how odious was the part of spy and traitor played by his accuser. He was, of course,

[28] On Blessed John Fisher, see Bridgett, *Life of Blessed John Fisher.*

condemned to death. More addressed his judges in stirring tones: "Since I am condemned, and God knows how, I wish to speak freely of your statute, for the discharge of my conscience. For the seven years that I have studied the matter, I have not read in any approved doctor of the Church that a temporal lord could or ought to be the head of the spirituality." The chancellor interrupting him, said: "What, More? You wish to be considered wiser and of better conscience than all the bishops and nobles of the realm?" To this More replied: "My lord, for one bishop of your opinion I have a hundred saints of mine; and for one parliament of yours, and God knows of what kind, I have all the general councils for a thousand years."

He was executed on July 6th, at 9 o'clock in the morning. To the very last he preserved a cheerful humor which was ever mingled with his Christian piety and magisterial gravity. The scaffold was shaky. As he stepped on the first round of the ladder, he said to the lieutenant accompanying him: "I pray thee, see me safe up, and for my coming down let me shift for myself." He knelt down, recited the *Miserere*, his favorite prayer, and rested his head on the block.[29] The Church honors Fisher and More with the title of Blessed.[30]

The execution of Fisher, known and esteemed in all the courts of Europe, and of Chancellor More, celebrated in the literary circles of the time, produced great emotion. No one could be more affected by it than the head of the Church. The two martyrs, before their death, had appealed from the king's judgment to God and to the Church. Since 1534 the Holy See had been occupied by Paul III, the eminent pope who redeemed the weaknesses of his past life by the gigantic efforts he made, amidst numberless difficulties, to convoke the Council of Trent. The Pontiff heard the final appeal of the holy bishop and the noble chancellor; he wrote to several princes that he intended to interdict the King of England and to release his subjects from their oath of allegiance. But purely political reasons kept the princes from promising the Pope eventual obedience. The "Most Christian King," Francis I, who held to his alliance with England, was unwilling to withdraw his ambassador from London; all he promised was neutrality. The Emperor, born defender of Christendom and of the rights of the Holy See, was afraid that, by declaring himself against Henry VIII, he would strengthen the Anglo-French alliance, which he already feared. Ferdinand, king of the Romans, said that he wished to follow the policy of his brother Charles V.

---

[29] See Bridgett, *Life and Writings of Blessed Thomas More*, and Brémond, *Vie de Thomas More*.

[30] Pope Leo XIII (December 9th, 1886) proclaimed as Blessed not only More and Fisher, but also the three Carthusian fathers, the Brigittine monk, and the secular priest who were executed in 1535.

Shortly afterwards, the Pope made a second attempt. Reginald Pole, who was Henry VIII's cousin, left England in 1532, so as not to be mixed up in the lamentable affair of the royal divorce, and wrote a treatise on the "Unity of the Church," wherein the King's religious policy was solidly refuted.[31] Paul III, who had the talent of employing men of worth, made Pole a cardinal, and, about 1537, entrusted him with a diplomatic mission to Francis I and Charles V, namely, to deliberate with the two sovereigns as to the means of leading England back to the Catholic faith.

But Henry's exasperation was further increased by Pole's embassy, in which he thought to discover conspiracy. The daughter of Francis I had just married the King of Scotland. What plot was being hatched? An invasion of England by Scottish troops? At that time this would have been an extreme peril. There was insurrection in the northern provinces. The firmness of the Pope's attitude had revived the courage of the Catholics. The destruction of several monasteries in the counties of Lincoln and York had led to a general uprising of the northern provinces. Thirty thousand men were in revolt, carrying a banner decorated with the five wounds, a chalice, and a host. This is what has been called the Pilgrimage of Grace. The astute Cromwell was at that time disposed to engage with the rebels in those lengthy negotiations which, by abuse of their loyalty, ended in their dispersion.[32] But the King gave free rein to his anger. Pole's mother and two of his relatives were put to death on unproved charges, and a price of 50,000 ducats was placed on the Cardinal's head. This measure was the height of royal abuse. The Sovereign Pontiff, in an allocution delivered in the presence of the cardinals (October 28th, 1538), recalled the series of crimes committed by Henry VIII, and two months later pronounced excommunication and the interdict against him.

---

[31] This work was composed at the King's request. But when it appeared in 1536, Henry VIII's ideas had changed. On account of it the King conceived a violent dislike for his cousin.

Executions and Confiscations

Henry VIII was first of all a statesman: the interests of his royal power, especially when he could reconcile them to his passions and his pride, outweighed every other consideration. It has been justly remarked that, "during the last eleven years of his reign, 'the supreme head' regulated the dogma, discipline, and worship of his church according to the changing vicissitudes of European politics. When the Pope seemed on the point of succeeding in his attempt to combine the Emperor and the King of France against England in the name of religious unity, considered as the basis of peace, then Henry VIII showed himself very Catholic in his formularies of faith and pitilessly hunted out heretics and sent them to the stake so as to deprive the Catholic sovereigns of their best pretext for armed intervention. When danger from that quarter subsided, Henry entered into relations with the German reform party, received and sent embassies, led them to expect the possibility of a treaty of alliance, which he always avoided concluding. At such times we see him seeking the advice of Melanchthon, the oracle of the Lutheran party." [33]

---

[32] For a résumé of these negotiations, see Trésal, p. 172.

The execution of fourteen Anabaptists, who were burned at the stake in June, 1535, between the death of Fisher and that of More, may have been a move of that two-faced policy. Before them, in 1533, pastor John Frith, who had attacked the doctrines of Purgatory and transubstantiation, and a poor London tailor who merely said: "I believe what John Frith believes," had perished at the stake. The *Ten Articles* of 1536, soon replaced by the *Six Articles* of 1539, seemed to be a doctrinal compromise between Catholicism and German Protestantism: but nothing was more obligatory than this compromise; yet no act shed more blood than this one of supposed conciliation.

The *Six Articles* ordered the acceptance of: (1) transubstantiation; (2) communion under one species; (3) ecclesiastical celibacy; (4) the binding force of the vow of chastity; (5) mass for the souls in purgatory; (6) auricular confession. Every contravention, even verbal, of these dogmas was punishable by death and confiscation of property; and—an unheard-of thing—abjuration did not save the guilty. Cranmer had to dismiss his wife. Even Cromwell, whose policy and procedure had been displeasing to the King, was accused of heresy as well as treason, and in spite of his cringing and hypocritical moves, was put to death (July 28th, 1540).

However, the atrocious repressive measures of the King and the calculations of his see-saw policy were strangely mingled with the freest fancies of his passions. By means of six wives, who were successively the victims of his caprice or fury, the religious supremacy became an object of contention between bishops who were secretly Lutheran, such as Cranmer, Latimer, Fox, Shaxton, and bishops devoted to the policy of the Six Articles ("Henrician bishops"), such as Gardiner, Lee, and Tunstall. Anne Boleyn, who was favorable to the Protestants, was decapitated for adultery, incest, and high treason in 1536. Then followed Anne Seymour, who died October 24th, 1537, in giving birth to the future Edward VI. Next came the Lutheran Jeanne of Cleves, advanced by Cromwell, but soon repudiated. The fourth was Catherine Howard, who represented the Henrician party and whom Cranmer had decapitated in 1542; lastly came Catherine Parr, who favored German Protestantism and who alone survived the King; it is true that at Henry's death she was about to be burned as a heretic. "Among the personages immolated by Henry," says Cardinal Hergenröther, "there were 2 queens, 12 dukes and counts, 164 noblemen, 2 cardinal archbishops, 18 bishops, 13 abbots, 500 priors and monks, and 38 doctors of theology or canon law." [34]

---

[33] *Ibid.*, p. 192.

So many crimes had been committed and rendered well nigh irreparable by the ruin of the English monasteries.[35] When the schism occurred, England counted about 800 monasteries of men or women. Henry first sought to ruin these houses by imposing crushing burdens on them. At the time of the Pilgrimage of Grace, he began tearing down a large number of monasteries in the north on the pretext that their abbots had committed treason. The hypocritical conduct of two men in particular made them especially odious in this work of destruction. These two, Legh and Layton, performed the duties of "visitors" in the name of the King. Denying that they had any wish to confiscate the monastic property and punishing those who spread such reports to their discredit, they induced the abbots to sign away the property, either by using threats or by offering large sums of money to the superiors as premiums for their unfaithfulness. The abbots of three large Benedictine monasteries, Reading, Glastonbury, and Colchester, declined these offers. The King had them condemned and executed as guilty of high treason.[36] Many others, convicted for a similar refusal, met a like fate. The last monastery was given up to the King on March 23rd, 1540. In less than five years was consummated the destruction of monasticism in England.

---

[34] Hergenröther, V, p. 421.

[35] On this question, see the scholarly work of Card. Gasquet, *Henry VIII and the English Monasteries.*

The King had promised that the wealth of the monks would be employed for the education of poor children, to provide pensions for aged servants, and to improve the highways. These promises were not kept.[37] "It would be impossible to exaggerate the importance of this unparalleled operation," says one historian. "The King kept none of the monastic property; he sold it; he gave it to his courtiers; during the last eight years of his life, he alienated the spoils of 420 abbeys or priories. These goods consequently passed into the hands of the gentry. Thus the whole upper class of the laity found themselves more or less concerned in maintaining the new order of things which procured such rich endowments for them. An analogous event took place in 1789 in the ranks of the French peasants after the division of the national possessions. In England the monastic domains served to endow the new aristocracy, which has been the strongest support of the religion of the Tudors." [38]

On the other hand, the condition of the common people was made worse by this immense transfer of property. The new owners, more exacting than the monks and not residing on their estates, were more rigorous in the matter of enclosing the communal pastures, which up to then had been left to the use of the poor. "In the year 1540 Parliament was obliged to come to the help of 57 cities fallen to decay in consequence of the destruction of the abbeys. The first collection for the poor, the beginning of the famous poor-tax, took place in 1538. Pauperism, one of the most hideous sores of England today, dates from the destruction of the monasteries." [39]

---

[36] Rymer, *Foedera,* VI, parts 3 and 4, pp. 15 sqq.

[37] Gasquet, *op. cit.,* p. 430.

[38] C. V. Langlois in Lavisse and Rambaud, IV, p. 576.

Such was the condition of Great Britain when King Henry VIII, old, corpulent, and apoplectic, long since threatened with his approaching end, died, on January 28th, 1547. He had sent for Cranmer the day before. When the bishop arrived at the King's side, the latter had lost his speech and almost his consciousness. While the prelate was exhorting him to give some sign of his confidence in Christ, the wretched monarch could only press his hand in a last effort of failing strength.[40]

---

[39] Trésal, p. 190.

[40] "Some say this unhappy prince, towards the end of his days, felt some remorse for the excesses he had run into; and, in order to calm his conscience, sent for some bishops to him. I vouch it not; those who in scandalous sinners, but particularly in kings, are for discovering such biting stings of conscience as appeared in an Antiochus, are not acquainted with all God's ways, nor reflect sufficiently on that deadly insensibility and false peace He sometimes suffers His greatest enemies to fall into. Be that as it will, should Henry have consulted his bishops, what could be expected from a body which had enslaved the Church? . . . He who could not brook truth from the mouth of Thomas More, his chancellor, nor from the holy Bishop of Rochester, both of whom he put to death for speaking it freely to him, never more deserved to hear it." (Bossuet, *Variations,* bk. 7, sec. 74.)

CHAPTER V

Protestantism in England

Edward VI

The successor of Henry VIII was a pale and sickly child, less than ten years old at the time of his accession, but already serious and gloomy. By the time he reached the age of thirteen he had a passion for theology and took pleasure in the talk of the most extreme reformers. He reigned for six years, keeping an almost daily record of the events of his life in an unchanging, laconic, and precise style. His maternal uncle, Count Seymour, seized the regency with the title of duke of Somerset. Seymour, who had long before accepted the Lutheran ideas, had early inspired the young Edward with a hatred for the Roman Church and its teachings. Cranmer, the archbishop of Canterbury, who had fallen into disfavor under Henry VIII, made haste, in Edward's reign, to recover the place of preponderance whence the influence of the Henrician bishops had driven him. At the same time he cast aside his mask of hypocrisy and loudly proclaimed himself the partisan of a doctrinal reform.

Under such auspices, not only Lutheran, but Calvinist and Zwinglian doctrines as well, invaded England, penetrated the official professions of faith, and were imposed on clergy and people by a tyranny even more absolute than that of Henry VIII.

Doctrinal and Disciplinary Measures

Parliament was a docile tool in the hands of the Protestant Somerset. Its first acts were to abolish all the laws against heresy, to suppress the vague "permission of election" accorded to the chapters, and to decide that episcopal appointments would henceforth be made by royal letters patent. Then were suppressed all corporations, guilds, fraternal and mutual benefit associations, of a religious nature; their goods were confiscated, as had been done with the abbeys, priories, and convents. Catholics were now deprived of the right of association, of all corporate property, and of all means of acquiring any.

The work of doctrinal and disciplinary destruction could then be pursued without fear of effective resistance. From the bishops was taken the right to authorize preachers; this was reserved to the King and Archbishop Cranmer.[1] For a while all preaching was suspended throughout the realm.[2] By way of silencing even the voice of the old ceremonies and the ancient images, by which the people received the traditional faith, the famous royal decrees of July 31st, 1547, overturned the liturgy and ordered the destruction of all pious representations, including paintings and stained glass windows. This was an irreparable loss to art. Then, as the liveliest discussions were taking place on the question of the Holy Eucharist, a royal order (issued December 27th, 1547,) forbade any teaching on this subject not contained in the Scriptures, until the King should determine the official doctrine.[3]

In March, 1548, an "Instruction on Communion" and a small ritual, taken from a compilation of Lutheran usage at Nuremberg, were published by royal order. Therein the obligation of auricular confession was suppressed, but the Latin Mass was still retained. This last point aroused violent discussion. Cranmer and his party were no longer satisfied with Lutheran doctrines; they went so far as to say, with Zwingli, Carlstadt, Calvin, and all the Sacramentarians, that the Eucharist is only a symbol, a simple commemoration of the Last Supper. These discussions eventually (January 15th, 1549) led to the promulgation by Parliament of the celebrated *Book of Common Prayer,* which, with various subsequent modifications, has remained the official and popular symbol of the beliefs of the Anglican Church. The Real Presence was admitted, but the prayers and ceremonies were stripped of whatever seemed "too much to favor transubstantiation or even the corporeal presence." [4]

---

[1] Burnet, *History of the Reformation of the Church of England,* II, p. 156.

[2] *Ibid.*

[3] Constant, *La transformation du culte anglican sous Edouard VI,* in the *Revue d'Histoire ecclésiastique,* January 15th, 1911.

The disputes were enlivened by the presence in England of several Lutheran theologians, to whom both teaching and preaching were entrusted, while silence was imposed on Henricians and Catholics. Vermigli, an Italian monk who had married a nun and who is known as Peter Martyr, was appointed professor at Oxford in 1547; a work published by him two years later frankly accepted Zwingli's radical doctrine on the Eucharist.[5] His compatriot, Bernardino Ochino, an unfrocked Capuchin and canon of Canterbury, taught almost identical doctrines. The arrival at Cambridge (April, 1529) of two German theologians, Bucer and Fagius, driven from Strasburg by the Interim, accentuated the Lutheran movement. They were given the two most prominent professorships of the English universities and their influence was felt throughout the realm. The Henrician bishop Gardiner was imprisoned for protesting.

In 1549 an uprising of the people in the West, enraged by the destruction of images and statues, starved by the suppression of the monasteries and religious fraternities, was crushed with the utmost cruelty by bands of Spanish, Italian,

---

[4] Bossuet, *op. cit.,* bk. 7, sec. 85.

[5] *Ibid.,* bk. 7, sec. 81.

Flemish, and German mercenaries.[6] But Somerset, the Lord Protector, did not long enjoy his triumph; his rival Warwick supplanted him in 1549. Somerset was accused of high treason and decapitated in 1552.

The Count of Warwick, the head of England's landed aristocracy, continued Somerset's religious policy with still greater violence. Warwick, as soon as he came into power, sent a circular letter to the bishops ordering them to direct the deans and canons of their cathedrals, as also the pastors, curates, chaplains, and church-wardens of all their parishes, to bring to them or their delegate all the antiphonaries, missals, graduals, processional books, manuals, saints' lives, mass books, ordinals and other liturgical books, according to the rites of Sarum, Lincoln, York, Bangor, or Herford. The bishops were further ordered, once they had these works in their hands, to destroy them so that they could never be used again and so as to complete the established uniformity.

Notwithstanding the strong opposition of the bishops and nobles, Warwick had Parliament pass a bill (January 25th, 1551) ordering the destruction of every kind of statue or image that still remained in the churches, only excepting the statues of kings, princes, or nobles who never were regarded as saints. The episcopal revenues also tempted the new government. Each new bishop was appointed on condition that he surrender one or two castles of his domain. When Pouet was raised to the see of Winchester, in 1551, he had to turn over to the Crown all the possessions of the bishopric in exchange for a pension of 2,000 marks.

This policy was not a thing to displease the young King. When Charles V threatened England with a war unless his niece, Princess Mary, were permitted to hear the Roman Mass, it was the King who refused any concession, in spite of the advice of his council.

---

[6] The insurgents especially demanded the restoration of the old public worship and the reëstablishment of two abbeys in each county, along with the restitution of half their lands. Hume says: "They were acknowledged to have been the best and most indulgent landlords." (*History of England,* III, p. 354.)

The King's sister, in fact, refused to have any changes made in the ceremonies of the Mass which was celebrated in her chapel, or in her other religious practices. In spite of the mutual affection between him and his elder sister, the King imprisoned the princess' chaplain and several of her servants. Mary protested that she was His Majesty's humble subject, but that she would lay her head on the block rather than accept a form of worship other than was in use at her father's death. The King dared not push the matter further. Mary had Mass celebrated secretly in her chapel, and the royal authority closed its eyes.

Unlike his father, who aimed only at making himself independent of Rome and who purposed remaining the "Defender of the Faith" until his death, Edward VI instinctively inclined to heresy and devoted his unconquerable tenacity to its spread. The Calvinist doctrine, more radical and clearly defined than the Lutheran, was more agreeable to his cold, apathetic nature and lucid mind,[7] whose very outbursts of anger seemed calculated. Martin Bucer wrote to Calvin (May 15th, 1550): "There is no study which the King pursues so earnestly as Holy Scripture; every day he reads ten chapters of the Bible with the closest attention." In another letter (May 25th) he writes: "The King is using all his authority to restore the kingdom of God." A French Protestant, Burgogne, wrote (December 4th, 1550) from London to Calvin that the King, in a conversation, had asked him many question about the Geneva doctrine. At the beginning of the following year, Calvin, emboldened by such information, found fault with Cranmer for his moderation and delay; the primate replied by urging Calvin to address the King directly.

---

[7] The Italian philosopher, Cardone, who saw the King about 1552 when the latter was about fifteen years old, declared that he was amazed at the King's seriousness and strength of mind.

The head of the French reformation had reason to be gratified. A second edition of the Book of Common Prayer, made obligatory from November 1st, 1552, notably modified the celebration of the Lord's Supper, eliminated every allusion to transubstantiation, prayers and other examples of the saints, abolished the memento for the dead, and suppressed sacerdotal vestments. Knox, whose doctrinal denials and boldness surpassed those of Calvin, in his recollections, written later, declared that Edward VI was "admirably disposed in favor of the truth." We know the meaning of such a declaration from such a pen.

The doctrinal work of Edward VI was crowned by the publication (1550) of the Ordinal, regulating the ceremonies to be observed in conferring Holy Orders, and by the compilation of a Declaration of Forty-two Articles, establishing the symbol of faith. The Ordinal, considered along with the changes it underwent in 1552, suppressed in the ordination of deacons and priests the ceremony called "the tradition of the instruments," or the touching of the chalice and paten, which some theologians regard as essential. Hence arose the question of the validity of Anglican Orders. The Forty-two Articles, edited by Cranmer and Bishop Ridley of London, contained a mixture of Lutheran, Calvinist, and Zwinglian ideas.

These "reforms" were not accomplished without considerable opposition. Five protesting Henrician bishops were deposed. In the contrary direction, there was gathering about John Hooper, Bishop of Gloucester, later on called "the Father of Non-Conformists"—a group of dissident irreconcilables who carried Calvinistic austerities to their utmost conclusions.

The decadence of the clergy was lamentable. Bucer wrote to Calvin: "Very few parishes have pastors qualified for their office. Most of them are sold to the nobility." [8] The Bishop of Gloucester stated that, out of three hundred priests visited by him, 160 were unable to recite the Ten Commandments.[9] Ambitious rivalry divided the bishops who were faithful to the King. The people, who were becoming more and more wretched, faintly murmured against the government. The pillage of churches, monasteries, and great monastic and university libraries had not enriched the treasury. The young King was ill. Warwick, Cranmer, Ridley, and all others who had power or influence at their disposal, feared a Catholic reaction upon Edward's death. At all costs, it was necessary to eliminate Princess Mary. The King's Council thereupon declared that the order of succession would be changed and that the heir to the throne would be Lady Jane Grey, a grand-niece of Henry VIII. When Edward died, on July 6th, 1553, Lady Jane was proclaimed Queen of England. The episcopate and a party of the nobility were devoted to her. But the rank and file of the nation, on being delivered from the "Protestant misrule," [10] acclaimed Princess Mary, who overthrew Jane Grey and entered London in triumph (August 3rd, 1553).

---

[8] Robinson, *Original Letters Relative to the English Reformation*, II, p. 546, *i. e.*, letter 253.

[9] Hooper, *Later Writings*, p. 251.

[10] "The reign of Edward VI, lauded by some as the sacred epoch of the English Reformation, and cursed by others, is to-day narrated in historical works by dignitaries of the Anglican Church under the heading, The Protestant Misrule." (C. V. Langlois, in Lavisse and Rambaud, IV, 590.)

CHAPTER VI

Protestantism in England

Queen Mary's Policy of Conciliation

THE accession of Queen Mary was an occasion of unmixed joy for all the persecuted, Catholics and Henricians alike. One of the reformers, a contemporary of these events, writes: "The papists, who had been always longing for this most wished for day, dig out as it were from their graves their vestments, chalices, and portasses, and begin Mass with all speed. . . . They, then, even the poorest of them, made voluntary subscriptions." [1] Gardiner, the head of the Henricians, was appointed chancellor of Cambridge University; Cranmer, the instigator of the most violent measures under Edward VI, was simply deposed, with the promise of a pension; Peter Martyr, the most radical and stirring of the Protestant preachers, received a passport drawn up in most honorable terms. The new Queen pardoned the conspirators who had taken up arms against her, except three of their leaders—Northumberland, John Gates, and Thomas Palmer—who were decapitated as traitors. Despite the Spanish ambassador's urging, she firmly refused to send Jane Grey to the block. At a meeting of her council, held August 12th, 1553, we find it recorded that, "albeit her Grace's conscience is stayed in matters of religion, yet she meaneth graciousely not to compell or constreyne otherwise then God shall (as she trusteth) putte in their hearts a persuasion of the truthe that she is in." [2] Her uncle, Emperor Charles V, encouraged her in this policy. In fact, he wrote, advising "that she should adapt herself with all possible gentleness, conforming to the decrees of Parliament and gradually restoring things as best she could, and that she ought to be, above all else, a good Englishwoman." [3]

---

[1] Robinson, *Original Letters,* I, p. 369, *i. e.,* letter 182.

[2] *Acts of the Privy Council,* IV, p. 317.

At the very outset an incident all but compromised the good harmony of the kingdom. Just when Cranmer's possessions were being inventoried to determine the amount of his pension, he issued a proclamation in which he spoke of the "horrible sacrileges" of the Roman Mass. The council sent him to the Tower. Soon a series of harsh measures, which were not all due to the Queen's will, and certain regrettable events for which it is hard to fix the responsibility, transformed the régime of pacification which it was sincerely intended should be inaugurated, into a régime of bloody repressions.

Bloody Repressions

The Queen's marriage with the Emperor's son, the future Philip II, was the first of these political mistakes and the starting-point of all the evils and misfortunes of her reign. This cold and apathetic Spanish husband, eleven years younger than the Queen, a man who never loved her, could be no support to her. In fact, he became the first obstacle to her policy. The marriage contract had, indeed, stipulated that England and Spain should be separately administered and that public offices in England should be confided only to Englishmen.[4] The people distrusted this foreign sovereign, who was said to be a fierce Catholic and a crafty statesman.

A young nobleman, Courtenay by name, whom it seems the Queen had favored as a wooer, turned bitterly against her, carrying with him a large number of other nobles. It was intimated to him that, failing to obtain Mary's hand, he might obtain that of her sister Elizabeth. Courtenay was the soul of several plots whose aim was to put Mary to death and raise Elizabeth to the throne. This occasioned many arrests, in consequence of which there were sixty executions. One of the chief personages involved was the Duke of Suffolk, Jane Grey's father. The council decided that he should be put to death as well as his daughter. The Queen felt obliged to yield. Jane Grey certainly was innocent; she was forced on the throne in spite of herself before Mary's accession, and she had never taken the least part in her father's rebellion. Truly touching were the last moments of the unfortunate maiden, barely seventeen years old: "My crime," she said, "is that I showed I was fit to be queen." She was decapitated February 12th, 1554. Her execution, which moved even the Queen's most devoted followers to tears, stirred the wrath of her enemies. This was the second great mistake of Mary's reign.

---

[3] *Papiers d'état de Granvelle,* IV, p. 55.

[4] *Statutes of the Realm: Mary,* chap. 2, p. 22.

Gardiner, the chancellor and former councillor of Henry, as also some Henrician prelates who tried to have their past weaknesses forgotten, displayed excessive zeal, urging the Queen to the most severe measures. At the end of 1553 there appeared a pamphlet calling the Henrician prelates "cut-throats" and "pickpockets." On the morning of April 8th, 1554, there was to be seen, near St. Paul's, hanging on a gallows, a dead cat dressed in priest's vestments and holding a host between its paws. On June 10th someone shot at a preacher delivering a sermon at St. Paul's.

The solemn reconciliation of the kingdom with Rome, celebrated November 30th, 1554 by the Queen and Cardinal Pole at Westminster, was a new occasion for the enemies of the Queen and of the Catholic Church to spread calumnious reports about Mary and the papacy. The Queen had been fearful of the consequences of this act, which would become necessary sooner or later, but for which public opinion needed to be prepared. She was aware that, although it was a simple matter to lead the nation back to Catholic ceremonies which had been abolished only four years previously, it would be otherwise with the papal supremacy, forgotten for thirty years past, misrepresented, dreaded by the possessors of former ecclesiastical property, who saw, though mistakenly, a menace in the measure.[5] The Pope, in fact, had declared that these possessors would not be disturbed. But the Queen, through a conscientious scruple, having restored to the former owners those goods which the Crown had not disposed of to individuals, there was produced a panic among the nobles whose fortune was built upon the property of the Church. Most of these noblemen held high places in the kingdom. Early in 1555 it was discovered that a certain Thomas Rose had organized in different parts of London secret religious services according to the Protestant practice, and that this prayer was used: "Lord, turn the heart of Queen Mary from idolatry, or else shorten her days." [6]

The erection of the seigniory of Ireland into a kingdom (1555) by Paul IV at the request of Mary and Philip was another cause of antipathy towards the Queen. Princess Elizabeth, whose attitude at the time of Courtenay's plots had been very enigmatical, took advantage of all these incidents against her sister.[7]

The Queen's councillors had, for some time past, been proposing that she revive the laws of Richard II, Henry IV, and Henry V, providing death at the stake for those who professed heresy and those who prayed for the death of the sovereign. The House of Commons and the House of Lords passed laws to this effect. These statutes were to go into effect on January 20th, 1555. On the 22nd ten preachers were brought before a commission on a charge of heresy. By the beginning of February, eleven heretics had been executed. The former primate, Cranmer, was convicted of heresy, adultery, blasphemy, and high treason, and died at the stake at Oxford. He had made no less than seven successive retractions, each of them more humble than the other. But at the stake he revoked these retractions and added: "If the Pope had saved my life, I would have obeyed his laws." But he died with firmness and courage. As the flames rose, he stretched out his right hand, on the pretense that it had been stained by a criminal signature, so that it might burn first.

---

[5] *"Plus difficultatis fit circa auctoritatem Sedis Apostolicae, quam circa verae religionis cultum; adeo falsis suggestionibus sunt alienati subditorum animi a Pontifice."* Letter from Queen Mary to Cardinal Pole, October 28th, 1553, quoted in Lingard, *History of England* (1878 ed.), V, p. 199. See Ancel's important study, *La reconciliation de l'Angleterre avec le Saint-siège sous Marie Tudor,* in the *Revue d'Histoire Ecclésiastique* (Louvain), 1909, X, pp. 521–536, 744–798.

[6] Trésal, p. 315.

[7] On Elizabeth's intrigues, see Lingard, V, chap. 5.

These executions accomplished little beyond multiplying hypocritical conversions and encouraging clandestine meetings and secret societies. The government in turn trembled and had recourse to penalties which in the sixteenth century did not have the odium which attaches to them in our day, but were none the less blameworthy. On February 6th, 1557, the bodies of Bucer and Fagius, who brought the first germs of heresy to England, were exhumed and burned in the Cambridge market-place, the body of Peter Martyr's wife, a former nun, was thrown on a dunghill.

Cardinal Pole, consecrated archbishop of Canterbury (March 22nd, 1556), made every effort to calm the Queen's impatient and unhealthy irritation and to counterbalance the influence of her imprudent councillors. But these efforts only helped to bring about his denunciation at Rome as being in connivance with the heretics. Pole fell into disfavor with

Paul IV, who was also ill-disposed towards the Queen of England. Philip II, who, following his father's retirement, had become emperor of all the Spains (January 15th, 1556), had drawn Mary into an alliance with Spain, which ran counter to the diplomacy of Paul IV. The last months of the life of this Queen, who had so intensely pursued the enemies of the Church, were marked by a coldness in her relations with the Holy See. But Cardinal Pole remained her faithful and devoted councillor to her last day. After a reign of five years, she died (November 17th, 1558) at the age of forty-two. The name of "Bloody Mary," which is often given her, has been inspired by partisan hatred rather than by a just estimate of her reign.[8] The recent publication of the secret papers of her reign confirms the previous conclusions of impartial historians as to the sincerity of her faith, the loftiness of her character, and the uprightness of her intentions. She was a victim of the difficulties of a period when, as has been said of another epoch, "it was harder to know one's duty than to do it." Her unhappy reign also shows that in human government acts of imprudence are often more fatal than crimes.

---

[8] There is endless discussion as to the number of executions that took place under Queen Mary. The Protestant historian Cobbett in his *History of the Protestant Reformation in England and Ireland* (letter 8) reckons only 300. But this author, who often adopts the tone of a pamphleteer, sometimes tends to exaggerate the faults of his coreligionists. Certain Protestant writers speak of 3000 victims. This figure is evidently a gross exaggeration. Impartial historians generally agree that the number of executions under Mary is far below the number of those carried out under Edward VI and Elizabeth. Why, then, has Mary's name remained more odious among Englishmen than the names of Edward and Elizabeth? Sectarian hatred alone does not suffice to explain this strange fact. It is noteworthy that the victims of the Protestant monarchs were especially priests and monks, whereas those of the Catholic Queen were fathers of families, whose outcries were more far-reaching, since their deaths affected a greater number of persons. Queen Mary's greater care to observe legal procedure in the trials made them the more widely known. Those who had come into possession of church property were always fearful of being dispossessed. Their consequent panic contributed not a little to stir up the people.

Queen Elizabeth

The same historians who speak of "Bloody Mary," generally call her sister "Good Queen Bess." The latter qualification, as we shall see, is no better justified than the former. The daughter of Henry VIII and Anne Boleyn inherited from her mother a passion for jewelry and a fondness for luxury and display. The trials of her youth, the régime of espionage in the midst of which she lived, and her prison life in the Tower had developed in her a spirit of defiance, falsehood, and perfidy. On taking possession of the throne left vacant by her sister Mary's death, she at first seemed favorable to Catholicism. She was crowned according to the Catholic rite, swore to protect the Roman religion, and proposed an alliance with the King of Spain. The Venetian ambassador Priuli wrote (November 27th, 1558): "No change can be seen in the churches; no insult has been offered monks and priests visiting London, and her Majesty still hears Mass as before." [9] But at the same time the new Queen, whose best support had always come from the Protestant party, surrounded herself with ministers favorable to the Reformation. Two of them, William Cecil and Nicholas Bacon, became the evil geniuses of her reign.[10] The Spanish envoy, Feria, was able truthfully to write, at the same time as his Venetian colleague: "Every day the Queen takes a stronger stand against religion." From the very outset Elizabeth put into practice those principles, if we may so speak, which came to dominate her whole policy. They consisted in subordinating everything to her personal interests, identified so far as possible with those of the nation, in making religion a national institution, and in governing it without control. Elizabeth, a pagan by taste and temperament in private life, displayed this quality also in her public life.

---

[9] *Acts of the Privy Council.*

[10] Nicholas Bacon was the father of the famous philosopher. William Cecil contributed greatly to England's commercial prosperity by developing her marine, which Wolsey had created. But the "Plan of the Anglican Reformation," drawn up by these two statesmen, is a masterpiece of perfidy.

After notifying Pope Paul IV of her elevation, she suddenly ordered her ambassador to break off all relations with the Holy See. Then she asserted her policy of progressive reform by the discreet revision of the Book of Common Prayer. She promulgated (February 25th, 1559) a decree, "restoring to the Crown its former jurisdiction over the ecclesiastical and spiritual state and abolishing all foreign authority in opposition to the Crown." In this act, the Queen, fearing lest she might alarm the non-conformists, whether Catholics or Calvinists, was at pains to attenuate the expressions current under Henry VIII. She does not call herself the "Supreme Head," but "the only Supreme Governor of this realm as well in all spiritual and ecclesiastical things or causes as temporal."

The organization of a hierarchy like that of the Roman Church, related to the Pope by ordination, but placed under the control of the Queen by jurisdiction, was the natural consequence of these first measures. Matthew Parker, a beneficiary in the time of Edward VI, then deprived of his office under Mary's government, was consecrated (December 17th, 1559) archbishop of Canterbury by the Protestant Bishop Barlow and three other prelates. This ceremony, using Edward VI's Ordinal, which suppressed the rite of the presentation of the chalice and paten, was performed by bishops who notoriously rejected the existence of the episcopate in the Church of Christ. It could not, with a safe conscience, be considered a valid ordination, and, as a consequence, all the Anglican Orders which depend on Parker must be regarded as radically vitiated and null.[11] Parker was deservedly reputed

[11] The question of the validity of Anglican Orders was, for a long time, freely discussed among Catholics. See Dalbus, *Les ordinations anglicanes;* Boudinhon,

to be a moderate man. His personal character evoked nothing but sympathy. By order of the Queen, the ornaments and ceremonies of the Church were rigorously preserved. These facts, considered in connection with what we have already seen of the condition of the English clergy in relation to the king, explains how, out of 2400 beneficiaries, barely 60 refused to take the oath of royal supremacy when it was required of them.

As for the common people, whom we have seen several times, in the reigns of Henry VIII and Edward VI, rising up for the defense of the religion of their fathers, their ardor had fallen. Whether long practice had accustomed them to obey the established power in spirituals, or the wide-spread calumnies against Rome had shaken their fidelity, or the excessive severities of Queen Mary had alienated many from the Catholic cause, the people in England never again upheld the cause of the Roman Church against the royalty and nobility. No resistance was offered to the bill (1562) which imposed the oath of supremacy, not only on ecclesiastics, but likewise on the chief civil officers, lawyers, and all teachers, whether public or private.

Elizabeth understood that her people were ripe for a more radical reformation. On the condition of freeing the Anglican religion of every element that was too markedly Calvinistic or Zwinglian, of bestowing on it the characteristics of an essentially national institution, and of representing all its enemies as enemies of the country, it was possible to hope to more and more accentuate its anti-Catholic character. The

Etude théologique sur les ordinations anglicanes; De la validité des ordinations anglicanes; Puller, *Les ordinations anglicanes et le sacrifice de la messe.* The encyclical *"Apostolicae curae"* (September 2nd, 1896) closed the question by affirming the nullity of Anglican Orders. The story of Hog's Head Tavern, according to which Parker was supposed to have been consecrated by Barlow at an inn amidst a ridiculous masquerade, is a legend pure and simple, doubtless founded on the well-known fact that Barlow did not believe in the episcopate. (Cf. Servière, *La controverse sur la validité des ordinations anglicanes d'après des publications récentes,* in *Études,* September 5th, 1912.)

Forty-two Articles, drawn up under Edward VI, were revised and reduced to thirty-nine. These Thirty-nine Articles, published in January 1563, by dubious phrases, modified Edward VI's declaration in its manner of expression rather than in substance. They rejected the primacy of the pope, the sacrifice of the Mass, "that sacrilegious invention," transubstantiation, Purgatory, the invocation of the saints, the veneration of images, and indulgences. Whosoever should do anything contrary to this symbol of faith was to be punished as a heretic. Elizabeth's Thirty-nine Articles have remained the code of the Anglican Church.

The new symbol might expect to encounter two classes of violators: the Catholics, and a group of independent spirits who derived their inspiration from Calvin and Zwingli and who were known as Puritans.

The Catholics, since the suppression of the papal embassy to London and the rupture of diplomatic relations between England and the Holy See, no longer had any official backing at court. Thus abandoned and leaderless, they found it difficult to agree upon a plan of resistance. Many thought they could be present at the offices established by the Book of Common Prayer; others abstained from them. The election of Cardinal Ghislieri, who took the name of Pius V (January 7th, 1556), reanimated their courage. The new Pontiff was a man whose energy was equal to his prudence. He formally condemned the Book of Common Prayer and granted to refugees, Harding and Sanders, authority to reconcile to the Church those of the faithful who had made themselves guilty of schism by their presence at the condemned offices.

Elizabeth's Persecution of the Church

Elizabeth was awaiting an occasion to persecute the Church for a motive of political interest. At the beginning of her reign the Catholics had not concealed their sympathy for Mary Stuart, queen of Scotland, a niece of Henry VIII, whom many regarded as the legitimate heir to the English throne. But thus far no overt act had cast any suspicion on their loyalty. Elizabeth cast Mary Stuart into prison after having promised her an asylum; this odious conduct so stirred certain Catholic noblemen that, in 1568, they formed a plot to free the captive. Elizabeth made out all Catholics to be coöperators with these nobles. As Mary Stuart had been married to King Francis II of France, Elizabeth accused the Catholics of being hired by the foreigner to betray her. Some hundreds of Catholics were put to death. Gibbets were erected through the length and breadth of the land and heavy fines imposed on anyone who fell under the slightest suspicion.[12] Pope St. Pius V, after long consultation, reflection, and prayer, published the Bull *"Regnans Dei"* (February 25th, 1570), pronouncing Elizabeth's excommunication and deposition.

Three bills of persecution were the Queen's reply. Whosoever should deny or cast doubt upon Elizabeth's right to the English crown was declared guilty of high treason. Formidable fines were the penalty for refusing to attend the Anglican services. A high court of commission was invested with exceptional inquisitorial powers. To find a more pitiless piece of legislation one must go to the French Terror of 1793. The situation became worse in 1581. The exercise of any priestly function, even the giving of asylum to a priest, made one subject to the death penalty. The prisons overflowed with Catholics. Numerous priests were punished with a traitor's death. Father Nelson and a seminarian, Sherwood, came from Douay to preach the faith in England; they were cut down alive at Tyburn.[13] Two English Jesuits, Fathers Persons and Campion, had been travelling hither and thither in England since 1580, in the midst of every danger, frequently changing their dress and name, celebrating the sacred mysteries in secret, and fortifying the faithful. Campion was arrested and martyred. In 1584, at the death of the bishop of Lincoln, the Catholics were without a bishop. They obtained an archpriest only in 1798. In 1585, on the pretext of new plots, the persecution was renewed with increased fury. In the next year, a courageous Christian woman, Margaret Clitherow, was martyred with barbarous brutality; a door was placed upon her and then weighted down until she was crushed to death.[14]

---

[12] English priests and monks, who were being everywhere hunted out, founded colleges and religious communities in foreign lands. The beginnings of the English colleges of Douai, Rome, Valladolid, Saint Omer, etc., date from this period.

The execution of Mary Stuart, whose last moments must needs provoke everyone's admiration, aroused the indignation of the Catholic world.[15] But after this execution Philip II was able to proclaim his right to the English throne, as husband of the former Queen Mary; the Catholics, despite the heroic loyalty of most of them,[16] were suspected of betraying England to Spain. It is well known how the devoted patriotism of the English and sudden natural disturbances brought about the destruction of the terrible Spanish Armada (1588).

---

[13] The students of the college of Douai promised to return to their country to preach the faith there.

[14] On these matters, see Destombes, *Histoire de la persécution en Angleterre sous Elizabeth,* and Leclercq, *Les martyrs,* vol. VIII.

[15] Mary Stuart would not have succumbed if Protestant fanaticism had not been arrayed against her. But, on the other hand, Elizabeth, in spite of her hatred and jealousy, would not have dared to outrage her "sister's" royal majesty if Mary, by too reliant relationship with the enemies of Elizabeth, had not given the latter the pretext for which she had long been seeking. This is the double conclusion of Lady Blennerhassett's *Marie Stuart,* which, though not offering any new documents, is a judicious summing up of the numerous works devoted to Mary Stuart.

[16] David Hume pays tribute to this loyalty of the Catholics. (*History of England,* IV, p. 258.) Others have thought that they would have been wiser to form a coalition like the League of French Catholics. Brugère, *Tableau de l'histoire et de la littérature de l'Eglise,* p. 731.

The Puritans

By temperament no less than by policy, Elizabeth detested the Puritans. Enamored of the literary and artistic culture of the Renaissance, she could not help being shocked by the speech and bearing of those austere, somber, almost savage men. Then, too, her whole religious hierarchy, so patiently constructed, was being assailed by the wild democracy of these innovators.

The Puritan spirit entered England at the beginning of Elizabeth's reign. Some English Protestants, persecuted during the previous reign, had taken refuge in Switzerland, where, through contact with Calvinists and Zwinglians, their Protestantism became more radical and severe. With the accession of the new Queen, they came back. From the doctrines of Zwingli and Calvin they took only what was adapted to the English mentality. The dogmas of "predestination" and "inamissible grace" became for them principles of practical life, fashioning them into haughty and independent spirits. Elizabeth, who rightly saw in their attitude an eventual danger to the monarchy, did not, however, organize any persecution against them. She regarded the Puritans in Scotland, where they had expanded prodigiously, as valuable auxiliaries against her enemy, the Catholic Mary Stuart.

The progress of the Puritan heresy in Scotland had been singularly favored by the sad condition of a clergy very lacking in culture and of a restless and impoverished aristocracy. The influence of a man of consuming energy and fervid eloquence, John Knox, gave it an entirely original character. From Geneva, where he was then (1557) living, John Knox published his famous "First Blast of the Trumpet against the Monstrous Regiment of Women." It was directed against the Catholic government of Mary Stuart. Soon afterwards, at Knox' instigation, some Scottish nobles formed the "Lords of the Congregation," in opposition to the Catholics, whom they called the "Congregation of Satan." In 1558 an apostate priest, Walter Milne, was condemned to be burned at the stake; the Puritans demanded complete freedom of worship. Knox came from Geneva the next year and let loose a veritable revolution. Churches and convents were given over to pillage, the superb cathedral of Saint Andrew was destroyed. A treaty was then made, granting liberty of worship to the Puritans; but they were no longer satisfied with that; they wanted to reign alone. Whilst their demands were growing more pretentious, their doctrines were becoming more radical. At the side of the Presbyterian Puritans, who wanted the Church governed by simple priests, there arose the independent Puritans, who recognized in every "saint," whether soldier, workman, or bourgeois, the right to ascend the pulpit and preach. The Established Church of England had adopted the slogan "No popery"; the Presbyterians shouted, "No bishop"; the Independents, "No priest," and even "No king."

It was to such men that Elizabeth, in self-defense, had to promise and give her support. France had taken the side of Mary Stuart; Elizabeth, therefore, had to accept the alliance of the Puritans. Once again, political interests overshadowed all other considerations. The Puritans, on their side, let Queen Elizabeth die in peace; but under her successor, James I, they clamored noisily and threatened both Church and monarchy.

As for the Catholics, their lot did not appreciably improve during the last years of the sixteenth century. The valiant Cardinal Allen took refuge in Rome and from there, so far as possible, directed their resistance. His death and the lamentable divisions among the missioners in England itself aggravated the trials of the persecuted Catholics. Just when she was planning to carry out some new means of persecution, Elizabeth died (March 24th, 1603). She left Anglicanism firmly rooted in English soil. It is due to her policy that the Established Church long remained, and still remains for many Englishmen, closely bound up with the national cause, as paganism was in ancient Rome. It is equally because of that utilitarian policy that England, once an apostolic nation at the side of France, is at the present moment not in the van in the accomplishment of that great mission, waiting for the day when, "tried by adversity or enlightened on the emptiness of her material prosperity, she will at length recognize that she needs the Catholic Church, even more than the Catholic Church needs her."[17]

[17] Brugère, p. 734.

CHAPTER VII

Protestantism in France

The Precursors

WHILE the revolt beyond the Rhine and in England led to the separation of two great nations from the Church, in France it merely brought about a violent upheaval of the social order. After many a rude shock, France in the seventeenth century recovered its religious, intellectual, and political equilibrium, which gave it Bossuet, Corneille, and Colbert. Whether we should attribute this result to the strong organization of its monarchy, to the coherence of its episcopate, to its ethnic temperament, to a particular protection of Providence, or to all these causes combined, is a problem which the simple narrative of events may help to solve.

The seed of French Protestantism was planted during the first years of the sixteenth century in a peaceful, friendly meeting of literary men under the patronage of a bishop, Guillaume Briçonnet, and its doctrine and organization were formulated in the work of a cleric of Noyon, John Calvin. How, in spite of the harsh, repressive measures of Francis I and Henry II, it succeeded in rapidly winning over a part of the people, the magistracy, and the nobility; how, in the reigns of Francis II, Charles IX, and Henry III, it engaged in bloody conflicts with Catholicism for the government of the kingdom and the direction of men's minds; how, in fine, it became established in the French State at the side of triumphant Catholicism under the form of a veritable political and religious power by favor of the Edict of Nantes—

therein lies the history of a hundred years of strife, polemics, wars, intrigues, plots, scenes of heroism and of horror, of glory and of shame.

The Classes in French Society

In French society at the beginning of the sixteenth century we can distinguish five clearly marked classes: the common people, the bourgoisie, the nobility, the clergy, and the court.

The condition of the common people was characterized by two facts: a rapid progress towards civil and political liberty, and, following the confusion that resulted from the progress of industry and commerce, an equally rapid spread of pauperism. Hence there resulted a general unrest, a moral and social lack of balance, and revolutionary instincts ready to break forth at the first appeal.

The great industrial, commercial, and financial movement that marked the end of the fifteenth century brought about a no less important evolution among the bourgeois. In the Middle Ages these did not constitute a distinct class, but formed a connecting link between the nobility and the populace. Yet, through a certain number of its members, it suddenly became the directing class of the State. These "argentiers," as they were called, such as Semblançay who was said to be a "quasi-king," or Briçonnet who negotiated alliances in the name of Francis I, formed real dynasties, no less powerful than the old nobility of the sword, often more pompous and insolent.

The feudal aristocracy was in full decay. Through principle and through fear of lowering itself, it was unwilling to engage in commerce, yet, on the other hand, wishing to preserve its traditions of luxury and vanity, it wore itself out in wretched expedients, burdened its estates with numerous and hateful financial measures, and had recourse to usurers, who confiscated its possessions unless it abdicated its independence by vassalage to the king. Thus was formed in the very heart of the nobility a contingent of the most disorderly battalions which we shall see taking part in the religious struggles.

The lower clergy, mingling with the people, exercised only a religious influence; the great rivalries of political factions at first left them almost indifferent. Later on, however, perceiving that the religious question was uppermost, they courageously threw themselves into the thick of the strife and, in the popular movement of the League, were found in the front rank.

Although the upper clergy of France, unlike those of Germany, were not at the head of veritable states, they were admitted to the king's councils and were to be found in the sovereign courts, the parliaments, and exchequer offices. In 1494 the president of the Court of Exchequer was Archbishop Briçonnet of Rheims, who received Holy Orders after his widowerhood; his son Guillaume it was who gave the first impulse to the reform movement. The régime of the Pragmatic Sanction led the upper clergy to a policy hostile to the Holy See, and under Louis XII they clearly took sides with the King against Pope Julius II. They were crushed by the concordat of 1516, which stripped them of notable prerogatives to the advantage of the pope and the king; yet they were not without defiance and irritation, the more so as the sometimes excessive cultivation of arts and letters turned many prelates aside from the maxims of the Gospel.[1]

Above all this hierarchy was the king. His power grew with the ruin of feudal institutions. In Louis XII, and especially in his successor, Francis I, the personal prestige of royalty was immense.

---

[1] Jean du Bellay, bishop of Paris, never separated himself from his Horace, not even at night. Amyot was rewarded for his translation, *Théagene et Chariclée*, by the abbey of Bellozane and, after his translation of Plutarch, was appointed bishop of Auxere.

Francis I was one of the most representative men of his time. Titian's portrait of him is, it seems, a masterpiece of fancy. We can better recognize King Francis, as he really was, in these few lines written by a Venetian ambassador following the King's entry into Paris, in 1515: "Afterwards came the King, armed and mounted on his barded horse. He did not stay under the canopy at all, but made a great disturbance on his horse, which was all the time prancing in the air. And the place was full of fine horses and riders who performed marvelous feats so as to show off before the ladies." This brilliant nobleman, cavorting in front of the ladies, in the midst of his lords, was Francis I. Such was his policy, his whole reign. He has been wrongly called "the knightly king"; rather is he "the dandy king." His rule of conduct was not honor, as meaning the judgment of a Christian conscience, after the manner of a St. Louis, but "the point of honor," understood as the judgment of men of the world.

Nor can we say that Francis I was the Mæcenas of genius, as might be imagined from the title "Father of Letters" which has been given him. He was a dilettante rather than an artist or a man of letters, favoring art and literature as an additional elegance which he might add to his other elegancies. He preferred brilliant to powerful works; but he was fond of them to the point of professing a sort of worship of them. Says Montaigne: "King Francis welcomed learned men about him as holy personages." He showered favors on Erasmus, Clement Marot, Leonardo da Vinci, Primaticcio, and Titian. He founded the Collège de France, built a great part of the Louvre, and created the Imprimerie Royale.

As a changeable and fluctuating statesman, Francis I deserves to have applied to himself the lines that he scratched on a window at the castle of Chambord:

"A changeable thing is woman
A fool he who ever trusts one."

He was always someone's follower, the follower of some group or coterie, always subject to changing and unstable influences.

The make-up of such a king's entourage must needs be of extreme importance. There we find three women who exercised a decisive influence over him. Until 1531, this position of dominance was held by his mother, Louise of Savoy. She was a strong-minded woman, entirely given to practical questions, consequently more concerned with politics and finance than with literature, art, or religion. She quite missed the import of the movement started by "the school of Meaux"; yet she inclined the King to the side of the first reformers rather than to the side of the Church and traditional doctrines. After her death, it was Margaret d'Angoulême, duchess of Berry, the King's sister, who seemed to occupy the only place in his affections. The interchange of tender feelings between brother and sister, as revealed by their correspondence, is expressed with such vivacity that the learned editor of the *Lettres de Marguerite d'Angoulême* considers that it justifies a suspicion of immorality.[2] Intelligent, spiritual, as scholarly as she was thoroughly French, feeling all the manifestations of art and beauty, Margaret had a passionate admiration for her brother.[3] A literary critic defines her tendencies by saying that "she enslaved herself through her strong feelings and freed herself by her good sense." [4] Margaret aided the reform movement even more than did her mother.

---

[2] Génin, *Lettres de Marguerite d'Angoulême,* preface.

[3] The Venetian ambassador Dandolo was not sparing in his praise of Margaret d'Angoulême: *"Questa credo la piu savia non dico delle donne di Francia, ma forse anco degli uomini. Cosi ben intelligente e dotta, qu' io credo pochi ne sappino parlar meglio."* (Quoted by Ranke, *Histoire de France pendant les XVI^e et XVII^e siècles,* I, p. 151.)

[4] Landon, *Histoire de la littérature française* (7th ed.), p. 233.

From the time of Agnes Sorel, there had not been seen in France any acknowledged mistress at the king's side. But Francis I furnished the spectacle. Madame de Chateaubriand, whose epitaph Marot wrote, and especially Anne de Pisseleu, duchess d'Etampes, exercised a most baneful influence on the King. When we recall that the latter succeeded in having her uncle, Antoine Sanguin, appointed archbishop of Toulouse, one of her brothers bishop of Condom, another, abbot of Compiègne, and her own sister abbess of Maubuisson, we may conjecture how great harm she inflicted on the Church and on France. We find written in Tavannes' *Memoires:* "Madame d'Etampes' band is governing."

About these frivolous women there gravitated a court nobility which Margaret d'Angoulême did not blush to picture in her licentious *Heptameron,*[5] that book "of brazen indecency, a mixture of devotion, mirth and morality . . . wherein the age could see itself." [6] Bayard's biographer says: "Never has there been seen a king of France over whom the nobility so much rejoiced." [7] If from such a circle there did at times come forth some measures against the reformers, would that bring comfort to the Church? Would she not rather be compromised by it?

Two institutions, of great weight by their very character and constitution, protested authoritatively against the innovators in the name of national traditions: they were the Sorbonne and Parliament. But if at first the members of the Sorbonne and Parliament do express themselves very clearly against Protestant doctrines, they soon become afraid of unduly favoring the Pope's authority and later support the followers of Calvin and refuse to accept the disciplinary decrees of the Council of Trent.

---

[5] Génin, in his preface to the *Lettres de Marguerite d'Angoulême,* shows that most of the characters in the *Heptameron* were real persons.

[6] Lanson, p. 235.

[7] *Le loyal serviteur,* p. 369.

Lefèvre d'Etaples

About 1516, while Luther was at Wittenberg working out his doctrine of justification, the foundation of his whole theological system, just before the great quarrel over indulgences, there was noticed in the scholarly and literary movement that was stirring men's minds at Paris, a venerable savant, a little man,[8] constantly surrounded and consulted by a group of youth, eager to be trained in the study of ancient languages, in the reading of old manuscripts, and in the criticism of sources. That gentle,[9] smiling old man, Lefèvre, was commonly known as Lefèvre d'Etaples (*Faber Stapulensis*), from the name of his birthplace, Etaples, in Picardy. He was born in 1455, came to Paris at an early age, and there enthusiastically studied philology, literature, mathematics, and the philosophy of Aristotle. Then, weary of profane studies, he turned with great fondness to the cultivation and meditation of Sacred Literature.[10] In 1512 he published his *Commentary on the Epistles of St. Paul,* wherein he says: "For a long time I was attached to human studies. But to my eyes there came so brilliant a light that human teaching seemed to me nothing but darkness in comparison with sacred studies, while these latter appeared to exhale a fragrance of such sweetness that nothing on earth equals it." Lefèvre did not pursue these "sacred studies" in the traditional manner of the doctors of the Sorbonne, but employed the methods raised to a position of honor by the learned men of the Renaissance, relying almost exclusively on Scriptural sources. A freshness of method might have its usefulness, even its necessity; yet in artificially separating Scripture from living tradition, of which it was but the partial expression and not by any means the only source, this freshness offered great dangers.[11]

---

[8] In 1519 Erasmus calls him an old man, *"senex."* Two of his contemporaries, Paulus Jovius and Scaevola de Sainte Marthe, insist on his small stature. The latter calls him *"homunculus genere staturaque perhumili."* (*Elogia gallorum illustrium.*) *"Statura fuit supra modum humile."* (Jovius, *Elogia doctorum virorum,* p. 363.)

[9] Erasmus speaks of him as being of *"natura mitis et blandus."*

[10] Graf, *Essai sur la vie et les œuvres de Lefèvre d'Etaples.*

The smiling courtesy of the gentle Lefèvre as well as his learning attracted to him a choice group of eager and inquiring minds. Along with aged scholars, such as the Hebraist Vatable, the orientalist Postel, and the erudite Budé, we find not a few young men, many of whom later, for various reasons, won great fame, such as Gerard Roussel, Guillaume Farel, and Josse Clichtove.

A bishop's patronage and the favor of a princess of royal blood soon gave considerable importance to the movement which Lefèvre had started. Among his most faithful disciples we find Abbot Guillaume Briçonnet of St. Germain-des-Prés, near Paris, with his eager, mystical mind and somewhat naïve enthusiasm, ready for any daring initiative. He belonged to that celebrated family of Briçonnet which, as we noted above, held so high a rank in the new financial and parliamentary aristocracy. He was made bishop of Meaux by royal decree in 1516. Guillaume had long since desired to reform the Church. One of his first cares was to thank the Cordeliers for the service they rendered the diocese in the preaching ministry and to replace them by young ecclesiastics, chosen from Lefèvre's circle in Paris. These new missioners read the Gospel in French, made little mention of rites and ceremonies, and called themselves "evangelists."

The "Cenacle of Meaux"

The new group derived its coherence from the presence of Lefèvre, whom the bishop of Meaux was not long in drawing to himself and whom he appointed administrator of the *Léproserie* in 1521 and vicar-general in 1523. In this circle, commonly known as the "Cenacle of Meaux," prudent ideas of reform were almost imperceptibly mingled with many rash ones and with more than one utopia. From it there issued a French translation of the New Testament and an Exposition of the Sunday Epistles and Gospels by Lefèvre; these were enthusiastically explained by the young preachers: Gerard Roussel, the future confessor of Margaret d'Angoulême, Michel d'Arande, who became bishop of Saint-Paul-Trois-Chateaux, the fiery Farel, destined to prepare the way for Calvin's coming in Geneva, and Pavannes, who was to die as an impenitent heretic at the stake.

---

[11] Lefèvre also published the works of Dionysius the Areopagite, Richard of Saint Victor's book on the Trinity, and Ruysbroeck's *Ornement des noces spirituelles.* Thence came a tendency to mystical piety, which degenerated into quietism. (Cf. Schmidt, *Les libertins spirituels.*)

The King's sister, Margaret d'Angoulême, who at this very time, upon reading the works of Nicholas of Cusa, became seized by an ardent desire for a philosophical and religious revival, could not help but follow sympathetically the activities of the school of Meaux. She soon began to enter into relations with Briçonnet. To him and his fellow-workers she addressed herself "just as," she says, "a sheep, wandering in strange pastures, naturally lifts its head to whiff the air coming from the place where the great shepherd, by his good ministers, gives it sweet nourishment." Neither Margaret nor Briçonnet nor Lefèvre then had the least desire, in combating abuses, to favor heresy. The bishop and the scholar gladly joined in the wish of the princess "that the faith be strengthened and the Church reformed, that heresies as well as vain fancies be driven out, and that the Church triumph by the victory of our faith." [12]

---

[12] Génin, *op. cit.*, II, p. 285. On Margaret's Protestant tendencies and the apparent contradictions in her conduct, see Hauser, *Études sur la Réforme française,* pp. 35–39; Lefranc, *Idées religieuses de Marguerite,* in the *Bulletin de la Société du Protestantisme Français,* January–March, 1798; *Marguerite de Navarre et le platonisme de la Renaissance* in the *Bibliothèque de l'École des Chartes,* 1897–1898; *Le mysticisme quiétiste au début de la Réforme,* in the *Bulletin de la Société du Protestantisme Français,* VI, pp. 449–461.

The events that happened in 1525 under the regency of Louise of Savoy, while Francis I was a captive, separated the elements composing the "Cenacle of Meaux," turning some in the direction of the Protestant revolt and recalling the others to the traditional teaching of the Roman Church.

In 1520 the Pope's solemn condemnation of Luther opened the eyes of the wiser men to the dangers of a reform of the Church by individual efforts in opposition to the divinely instituted hierarchy. Clichtove, one of Lefèvre's first disciples, suddenly turned against Luther and by his treatise on Devotion to the Saints (1523) and his *Antilutherus* (1524) publicly retracted his former opinions.[13] It was in vain that Luther, in 1521, praised "that pillar of learning and integrity," [14] who was none other than Lefèvre d'Etaples, and that the latter counted Luther among those "whom he cherished in Christ." These courteous expressions did not banish the double meaning which lay hidden under the word "reform," employed by the German heresiarch and by the head of the school of Meaux.

The Latin writings of Luther, however, began to enter France. The Sorbonne took alarm. In 1520 it had created a new office, that of syndic, a sort of dean especially charged with prosecuting religious errors. This position was confided to a man whose absolute integrity, perfect disinterestedness, and inflexible independence seemed not to admit the least shadow of a doubt. He was Noël Bedier, or Beda.[15] He had already fought against Erasmus, his old friend, and was destined to fight throughout his life and to attack, one after another, the religious and literary innovators, the King of England, and the King of France. Invincibly attached to tradition, with which he indiscriminately and mistakenly confounded current opinions that were really open to examination and correction, he had in 1519 violently attacked Lefèvre d'Etaples on account of his publication (1512) of a dissertation *De Maria Magdalena,* in which he maintained that under the one name employed by the evangelists we should recognize three different women.[16] Beda answered him by a "Scholastic Declaration of the Opinion and Rites of the Church concerning the one Magdalen." One of the new syndic's first cares was to obtain from the faculty of theology the condemnation of the book *De Maria Magdalena.* From that time suspicion fastened on the leader of the "Cenacle of Meaux" and his disciples.

---

[13] Clerval, *De Jodoci Clichtovei neoportuensis vita et operibus.*

[14] "*Eruditionis et integritatis columen*" (quoted in Lavisse, *Histoire de France,* V, part 1, p. 351).

[15] Noël Beda's character has been unfairly blackened by most Protestant historians. See *Revue des questions historiques,* October, 1902; see also Feret, *La faculté de théologie de Paris, Époque moderne,* II, p. 4.

The troubles accompanying the regency of Louise of Savoy, in 1525, showed these suspicions to be not without some foundation. A Bull of Pope Clement VII (May, 1525) at the regent's request assigned to three members of Parliament and one of the pastors of Paris the duty of investigating heretical sectarians. The "evangelists" of Meaux did not hide their irritation. Events then showed how perilous it is to sow the spirit of insubordination among the people. "If this reign of terror should continue," wrote Gerard Roussel on September 27th, "no one will any longer dare in safety to announce the kingdom of Christ." The words of the Meaux theorists were picked up by men of action. Some of the faithful at Meaux tore up the papal Bull. A certain wool-carder, Jean Leclerc, put up a poster wherein the Pope was called the Antichrist. Leclerc was whipped and branded on the forehead.

---

[16] In a brochure, dated April 26th, 1675, and first published by Emery in *Opuscules de l'abbé Fleury* (p. 320), Bossuet maintained that "it is more conformable to the letter of the Gospel to distinguish these three saints: the sinful woman who came to the house of Simon the Pharisee; Mary, the sister of Martha and Lazarus; and Mary Magdalen, out of whom our Lord expelled seven devils." (*Op. cit.,* p. 324.) Cf. Bossuet, *Œuvres complètes,* Lachat ed. XXVI, pp. 114-116; Levesque and Urbain, *Correspondance de Bossuet,* letter 428, note 25.

He then fled to Metz, a city of the empire, where he smashed a statue of the Blessed Virgin Mary and for this deed was condemned to the flames. Jean Leclerc has remained one of the most popular martyrs among Protestants.[17] For acts of a like nature, Pavannes, another member of the "Cenacle of Meaux," was burned at the stake in Paris the next year (August, 1526). He is no less famous than Leclerc in the annals of Protestantism, being the first Protestant who was executed in France.

It was time for the leaders of the reformist movement to emerge from their equivocal position and declare themselves either for or against the Church. Vatable, Michel d'Arande, and Briçonnet did not hesitate. The Bishop of Meaux excommunicated the perpetrators of the insult to the papal Bull and published two vigorous mandates against the Lutheran errors.[18] After explicitly condemning the books of Martin Luther, "who has laid the axe to the very root of the Church," he forbade all the faithful "to buy, read, possess, spread, or approve . . . the books of the said Martin" and ordered his clergy not to allow Lutherans to preach, as also "all others professing their doctrines." Pavannes and Farel abruptly separated from the Church; Roussel took refuge in Strasburg, whence he betook himself to Princess Margaret. As to Lefèvre, he went to Strasburg with Roussel, but we do not learn that he ever did anything that smacked of nonsubmission. Catholics have no right to make a hero of this honest but tactless man; but the Protestants are no less mistaken in claiming him as a precursor of their doctrines.[19]

---

[17] Crépin, *Acta martyrum,* bk. 4; Théodore de Bèze, *Histoire ecclésiastique des églises réformées au royaume de France,* bk. 1; Felice, *History of the Protestants of France,* p. 22.

[18] Some authors, however, think that Briçonnet's mandates date from 1523. See Berger, *Le procès de G. Briçonnet,* in the *Bulletin de la Société du Protestantisme Français,* 1895.

[19] "In 1512 Lefèvre published his Commentary on the Epistles of St. Paul. He

Attitude of Francis I

The court now had to face the necessity of deciding on which side it would stand in the question of heresy. It was dominated by two influences, that of Parliament and the Sorbonne, which had decided to deal severely with the innovators, and that of the humanists, inclined to indulgence. At the head

---

anticipated and equaled the boldness of Luther and Zwingli, affirming unreservedly the exclusive authority of Scripture, salvation by faith and not by good works; he disapproved of prayers in Latin, the celibacy of priests, and local superstitions. He even went so far as to say that 'ablution in the water of Baptism does not justify, but is only the sign of justification by faith in Christ.' Lastly he declared that 'what takes place daily [in the Mass] by the ministry of the priest is not so much a repeated sacrifice as an act of commemoration.' Michelet said with wilful exaggeration: 'Six years before Luther, the venerable Lefèvre was teaching Lutheranism at Paris.'" (Ferdinand Buisson in Lavisse and Rambaud, IV, p. 479.) We can see how far Michelet's wilful exaggeration went, by referring to Lefèvre's Commentary itself. Lefèvre admits the spiritual authority of the pope and even his temporal authority, as it was understoond in the Middle Ages. "In things sacred," he says, "the secular ruler must obey the sacred ruler." If he deplores abuses on the part of bishops, monks, and priests, he does so no more vigorously than was done by St. Peter Damian and St. Bernard. On the very important question of justification by faith and the merit of good works, here are his very words: *"Neque credas sufficere ut continuo justificatus sis, si fidem habes. Nequaquam ita est. Nam non quisque ex fide justificatur, ut fides ipsa justificatio sit, ut neque opera. Etenim credunt daemones, ut inquit Jacobus apostolus; sed ex fide justificamur quemadmodum ex operibus, ex his remotius, ex illa vicinius. Neque fides neque opera justificant, sed preparant ad justitiam, quemadmodum unus est Deus qui justificat."* Lefèvre also makes the bold assertion that *"maxima pars hominum non orant cum intellectu; orant enim in linga quam non intelligunt."* In the matter of local superstitions, Lefèvre says that many do wrong to abandon Christ for popular superstitions. He says also that the Saviour's stigmata are more to be venerated than those of St. Francis. (Graf, *op. cit.*, pp. 76, 79, 80.) The text of Lefèvre's Commentary, *"Ablutio circa nos materialis aquae in baptismate non justificat, sed signum est justificationis,"* taken by itself and with exact literalness, would be Zwinglian. But it should be supplemented by other passages in which Lefèvre admits the baptism of infants and declares that Christians are justified upon emerging from the sacred water. In the matter of sacerdotal celibacy, he declares, following St. Paul, that *"vita thori bona est et vita abstinens a thoro bona, sed vita abstinentium a thoro propter Christum ut caelibem vitam ducentes, sanctius puriusque vacent orationi . . . operibus misericordiae melior est."* He did say, it is true, that the state of virginity is salutary only for those whom God calls thereto and, after saying that the Church formerly admitted it, he adds: *"Agamiam ac-*

of the former party was Noël Beda, whose policy seemed justified by the events and who called for a vigorous repression. The King's sister, Margaret d'Angoulême, on the other hand, became, with her brother and in the opinion of the public, the interpreter of those feelings of good-will which were cherished by the literary world towards the reformers. During Francis' captivity she wrote him several letters expressing this view. When through her marriage to Henry d'Albret, Margaret became queen of Navarre (1527), she increased her favors to the dispersed members of the "Cenacle of Meaux," received Lefèvre, Roussel, Marot, and Calvin himself at her castle of Nerac, and, mingling mysticism with frivolity, tried to force on her court a new liturgy, derived more from Calvin's ideas than from Catholic tradition.

Between these two influences the King fluctuated undecided. He kept this attitude during the whole time of his reign, in which harsh persecutions alternated with unexpected favors to the reformers.

In 1527 Beda discovered that a nobleman of Artois, Louis de Berquin, had translated several of the German reformers' works and was spreading them among the people; he at once began proceedings against him. But Berquin enjoyed friendly relations with Erasmus and other literary men, and with the court; Margaret d'Angoulême intervened, and the King had him released. The next year, on the day after Pentecost, there was found before the door of St. Anthony's church in the

---

ceptaverunt aliae ecclesiae, unde plurimi, per deteriorem incontinentiam lapsi, in pedicas inciderunt diaboli." But this is merely a more or less exact statement of historical fact that is nowise to the prejudice of dogma or discipline. As for the sacrifice of the Mass, Lefèvre does, indeed, speak of one only sacrifice; but he seems to do so in the sense which all Catholic commentators have attributed to the Epistle to the Hebrews. He says: *"Non tam sunt iteratae oblationes, quam unius ejusdem, et quae semel tantum oblata, est victimae memoria et recordatio."* Moreover, he energetically professes his belief in the real presence of Christ in the Eucharist.

Saint-Germain parish a statue of the Blessed Virgin Mary mutilated by the heretics. Parliament and the King were aroused. Francis promised a liberal reward to whosoever would denounce the guilty and replaced the broken statue by a silver one, which he himself carried amidst an imposing procession. Louis de Berquin was caught in a second offense, rearrested, condemned and promptly executed by order of Parliament during the King's absence at Blois, for fear the guilty man might be saved through court influence.[20]

In fact, the court allowed itself to be more and more won over to the new ideas. It purposed employing that "Christian liberty which shakes off superstitions and excesses." The "sweet and titillating chanting" of Clement Marot's rhymed psalter was most pleasing to the ears of the elegant lords and ladies. While Parliament, as the inexorable custodian of public order and national traditions, was prosecuting heresy without intermission, the court was singing Margaret's canticle:

"Awake, Lord God, and everywhere
Avenge the death of Thy dear ones.
Thy will it is to have the Word
Announced by Thy devoted sons
In every palace, hamlet, town,
With nothing even half-concealed.
Give to Thy servants hearts right strong
To meet their death with glowing love."

Encouraged by such protection in high places, the Protestants became bolder. In 1530 statues of the Blessed Virgin, of the Infant Jesus, of St. Roch, and of St. Fiacre, set up at street corners, were smashed. Parliament made some new arrests; the King ordered more expiatory processions. In the autumn of 1533 certain political events led the King to declare himself clearly against the Protestants. In the course of negotiations to arrange the marriage of his son, the Duke of Orleans, to Catherine de' Medici, Clement VII's niece, Francis I at an interview in Marseilles (October, 1533) promised the Pope to proceed vigorously against heresy. But he had scarcely left Marseilles when a complete reversal took place in his dispositions. At Avignon, in November, he conceived the plan of an alliance with the Protestants of Germany. Having reached Lyons, he learned that a book by his sister Margaret, entitled *Miroir de l'âme pécheresse* (Mirror of a Sinful Soul), the very book containing the celebrated lines on tolerance, had just been condemned by the Sorbonne and that the students of the College of Navarre, in a shameless farce, had played the Princess of Angoulême on the stage. The King was unable to restrain his wrath. From Lyons he issued an order exiling the syndic Beda to a distance of thirty leagues from Paris and placed the head professor of the College of Navarre under arrest.

---

[20] Felice, p. 27.

Then did the boldness of the Protestants increase still more. Étienne Lecourt, a parish priest of Condé-sur-Sarthe, said: "If St. Peter's bones were in my church, I would bury them; and if my parishioners should come to venerate them, I would put the bones in a sack and throw them into the river." Such words aroused the indignation of the Catholics. This time Margaret's intervention was powerless to save Lecourt, who was burned alive at Rouen in December, 1533.[21] To the influence of the Duchess of Angoulême was added that of the Duchess d'Etampes, inclined in favor of the innovators, and that of another person more worthy of being listened to, Pierre Duchatel, the King's almoner, a man of undoubted orthodoxy, but a foe to bloody measures.

---

[21] We do not include in the number of Protestant victims Étienne Dolet, whom many Protestants have repudiated as an impious libertine. (See Duval Arnould, "Étienne Dolet," in *La Quinzaine,* August 1st, 1898.)

But these influences were neutralized by the growing dominance of Cardinal de Tournon, the King's chief minister. This able statesman, looking at things especially from the point of view of public order and national peace, which he considered to be upset by the Protestant sect, impelled the sovereign towards a policy of harsh repression. Piles blazed at the Halles, at the Saint Michel bridge, at the Place Maubert, at the cemetery of St. John. Strange to relate, during this very time, the King was carrying on negotiations with the Landgrave of Hesse, the political leader of the German Protestants, sent Guillaume du Bellay on an embassy to the Lutheran princes and the Swiss Leaguers, and engaged in personal correspondence with Melanchthon.[22] The policy of public order and national defense, which seemed to call for the persecution of Protestants in France, required that they be favored abroad.

At the close of 1535, tranquillity prevailed, following an edict which granted amnesty to "all those under arrest, whether as contumacious or suspected of Lutheranism, provided they would henceforth live as good Catholics and abjure their errors within six months." Was this measure prompted by the need of adopting a gentler attitude towards the Lutherans of Germany or was it inspired by the influence of the court, or by a letter from Pope Paul III, reminding the King "that God the Creator has employed mercy rather than strict justice and that burning a man alive is a very cruel death?" [23] It is difficult to say. The word "Lutheran," inserted in the edict, would seem rather to have in mind the German Protestants, who at that time detested the Calvinists; as for these latter, including nearly all the French Protestants, the King remained free to take measures against them.[24]

---

[22] See Bossuet, *Defensio declarationis cleri gallicani,* chap. 23.

[23] This papal letter is to be found only in the *Journal d'un bourgeois de Paris* (Lalanne ed., p. 458). No other collection contains it. It is likely on the Pope's part; that very year, 1535, he wrote to the Swiss Catholics: *"Vos ab armis contra alios Helvetios abstinere, quantum salva ipsa catholica fide fieri possit, hortamur in Domino."* (Raynaldi, 1535, no. 27.)

Massacre of the Vaudois

The most tragic episode of that repression was the massacre of the Vaudois in Provence. On both slopes of the Alps there were a few clans of shepherds and laborers, the last fragments of the heretical sect of Peter Waldo, living isolated, fiercely attached to their old traditions, and well nigh forgotten by the public authorities. Oecolampadius and Bucer had in vain tried to win them to their cause. There was one doctrine of Protestantism which invincibly repelled these free mountaineers—the denial of free will. A former member of the "Cenacle of Meaux," Guillaume Farel, was more successful. At the foot of Mount Geneva, in the valley of Angrogne, on the frontier of France and Italy, Farel's eloquence, after prolonged conferences, finally (1532) won the Vaudois communities over to Protestantism.

In the midst of the wars and rivalries that threatened France from outside, the setting up of a sort of Protestant State on the frontiers was certainly not without danger. This consideration justified a careful watch being kept on the Vaudois communities. Combined with motives of a different sort, it led to terrible scenes of carnage.

An inquiry ordered by the parliament of Aix brought to light deeds of pillage and murder, evidences of a plot, and the patent existence of heresy, charged against several towns of Provence, principally the two towns of Mérindol and Cabrières. Chassanée, president of the parliament, resolved to terrify these populations by a formidable decree. He had the parliament order that the towns of Mérindol and Cabrières be set afire, the trees cut down throughout the whole extent of the territory, and the land sold without the inhabitants or their descendants ever being allowed to acquire them again, lease them, or cultivate them under any title whatsoever.

---

[24] Du Bellay, *Mémoires*, bk. 6 (Petitot Collection, 1st series, pp. 345 sqq.).

This terrible decision, the execution of which neither parliament nor the King intended to hasten, would undoubtedly have remained a mere threat, if local passions and rivalries had not supervened. Five years passed by. The bishop of Carpentras, on whom Cabrières depended, was the scholarly and pious Sadoleto, who, in 1539, when requested by the vice-legate to adopt severe measures against the heretics,[25] replied: "I will employ these powers if it becomes necessary; but I will endeavor that it be not so. . . . It is not by the terror of torture, but by the power of the truth and by Christian mildness that I want to elicit from their hearts the abjuration of their false doctrines." [26]

In 1545, while Sadoleto was in Rome, Chassanée was succeeded in the presidency by Jean Maynier, baron of Oppède. This harsh and hateful man, humiliated because a lady of Cental, suzerain of the Vaudois, had refused him her hand, desired to avenge this personal affront by ruining the villages that depended on the house of Cental. Seconded in his schemes by the advocate general Guerin, the terrible magistrate found a pretext in a connivance of the Vaudois with the foreigners —a connivance of which he could furnish no decisive proof. He persuaded Cardinal de Tournon to authorize the execution of the decree of 1540. At the same time he kept in his service bands of freebooters, recruited by a soldier of fortune, Baron Paulin de la Garde; placing himself at the head of these troops, he conducted them toward the heretical districts. Cabrières, Mérindol, and twenty-two villages were given up to fire and sword, three thousand persons were slaughtered.[27]

---

[25] The town of Cabrières, located in the Comtat Venaissin, was dependent on the Holy See, whereas the Vaudois of Mérindol were subjects of the French king.

[26] Raynaldi, 1539, no. 34.

[27] This is the figure admitted by Daniel, *Histoire de France*, X, p. 572.

Public opinion was aroused against such a butchery. It is said that when, two years later, Francis I was dying, assisted by his confessor Pierre Duchatel, he recommended to his son Henry II that he investigate the injustices committed in the Cabrières and Mérindol massacre. At any event, public opinion demanded a reparation. This was partially accorded in 1552. Baron d'Oppède and Baron de la Garde, thanks to the protection of the Guises, escaped execution; but advocate general Guerin had his head cut off.[28]

Such massacres, instead of restraining the ardor of the heretics, only stirred them up the more. "When men allow themselves to be won by the allurement of novelty," says Bossuet, "torture and execution do more to inflame them than to stop them." [29]

A Catholic historian of the time, Florimond de Rémond, has depicted the scenes presented by the new persecutions. You might see, he says, "silly women seek torture to give a proof of their faith and, on their way to death, call upon Christ the Saviour and sing psalms. The men rejoice at the sight of the frightful preparations and instruments of death. . . . These constant, terrible scenes disturb the souls, not only of the lowly, but also of the greatest. . . . Others have compassion on them; at sight of those black corpses in public places, they cannot restrain their tears; the very hearts would weep with the eyes." [30]

Happily Providence supplied other remedies for the evils that were afflicting Christendom. While the Parliament of

---

[28] See Bouche, *Essai sur l'histoire de Provence,* II, pp. 78–86: *"Histore de l'exécution de Cabrières et de Mérindol"*; Gaffarei, *Les massacres de Cabrières et de Mérindol,* in the *Bibliothèque de l'École de Chartes,* May–August, 1911.

[29] Bossuet, *Histoire de France pour le Dauphin,* the reign of Henry II.

[30] Rémond, *De la naissance de l'hérésie,* bk. 7, chap. 6. The Protestant martyrology was published in 1554 by Jean Crespin. It had a considerable success. Several new and enlarged editions came out. In 1560 a quarto edition was published, then one in folio. At the same time editions in 16mo and 8vo were put in circulation, besides a Latin translation.

Paris was inaugurating a policy of harsh repression, a Spanish knight, Ignatius of Loyola, and six friends were on their knees in the church of Montmartre, consecrating their lives to the service of the Church in poverty, chastity, and obedience. During the year 1545, while the ruins of Cabrières and Mérindol were still smoking, the most venerable prelates of the Church were on their way to the Council of Trent, there to deliberate on the reform of the Church.

CHAPTER VIII

The Beginnings of Calvinism

French Protestantism was the more confident in itself as at length it had a body of doctrines. In 1535 there appeared a book, dedicated to the Most Christian King, Francis I, and claiming to be "the confession of faith and summary of a doctrine which all the States, by a common accord, united in condemning." The work was entitled "Institutes of the Christian Religion"; it came from Switzerland, where its author, John Calvin, a Frenchman by birth, had taken refuge.

John Calvin

The work and the person of John Calvin were destined to play a preponderant and decisive part in the future of French Protestantism. He was born at Noyon in Picardy (July 10th, 1509). As in the case of Luther and Henry VIII, so in that of John Calvin, history is unable to draw a sharp line between what is due to the heresiarch and what is imputable to the influence of heredity and environment, in fixing the responsibility for so many evils let loose by heresy; it can but register the facts, essay conjectures, and leave the final judgment to God. As we learn from a compatriot of Calvin, "there was no city more thoroughly Picard than Noyon. None better exemplified that mixture of censoriousness and stubborn dogmatism which is characteristic of the district." [1]

In the circle of procurators and business men that formed a considerable part of the Noyon bourgeoisie, there was one who was distinguished by his litigious bent of mind and his unceasing quarrels with the clergy. He was fiscal procurator, secretary of the bishopric, and proctor of the chapter,[2] Gerard Cauvin by name. Rarely has the Church had reason to felicitate herself on account of that class of men of the law, at her side, living on her, but without having her spirit. Cauvin was excommunicated in 1531 and buried without religious rites. Charles, his eldest son, undertook to carry on the difficult matters left by his father and died under the same conditions, three years later. Such a family history could not but have an influence on the character of the second son, John, who changed his family name to Calvin.[3] The cunning Picard, before dying in a situation deeply involved in debt, took care to assure the temporal future of his son John by obtaining for him the protection of the noble family of Hangest and several ecclesiastical benefices.[4]

---

[1] Lefranc, *La jeunesse de Calvin,* p. 25.

In 1523 this boy, then fourteen years old, quit Noyon [5] and went to Paris to follow more advanced studies, which he continued at Orleans and Bourges. In the words of Florimond de Rémont, a contemporary, Calvin "had an active mind, an unusual memory, great aptitude and quickness in learning, as also an extraordinary facility and beauty of language." This young student, with such rare gifts of mind, did not lack excellent teachers. He studied belles-lettres at the Montaigu College, which was then governed by Beda, studied law under Pierre de l'Estoile and the famous Andrea Alciati, followed the classes of Melchior Wolmar and Peter Danes in Greek, began the study of Hebrew under Vatable, and became interested in the works of Budé.

---

[2] Henry Lemonnier in Lavissė, *Histoire de France,* I, part 1, p. 369.

[3] The leader of French Protestantism had many pseudonyms. That which was the least removed from his real name was Calvinus. He also signed himself Alcuinus, Lucanius, and Chambardus. This last pseudonym is found in correspondence with his friend Baduel, which is preserved in the library of the Calvet museum at Avignon (no. 1290).

[4] In 1521 the Gesine chapel in the cathedral was assigned to him. Six years later he was assigned the curacy of Marteville, which he exchanged for that of Pont l'Evêque near Noyon in 1529. As Calvin was barely twelve years old when he obtained his first benefice, he was naturally unable to exercise its functions. He divided the revenues of it with the priest who was delegated to perform its duties. In 1534 Calvin resigned from the curacy of Pont l'Evêque for a money consideration.

[5] In 1558 Simon Fontaine wrote in his *Histoire catholique de notre temps* (p. 193): "Infamous reports have been spread regarding the life of Calvin which, if they were true, would furnish irrefutable arguments of the extreme bestiality of that place [Noyon]." Later on Du Préau, Démocharés, la Vacquerie, Surius, Bolsec (in his *Histoire de la vie de Jean Calvin,* p. 28), and Richelieu (in his *Traité pour convertir ceux qui se sont séparés de l'Eglise,* bk. 2, ch. 10, p. 291) made these accusations more specific. According to these reports, Calvin was obliged to leave the city of Noyon because of infamous vices for which he would have been condemned and branded. Desmay (*Archives curieuses de l'histoire de France,* p. 390) wrote: "I heard from some very old canons of Noyon that they had seen a blank

Most of these men were involved in the religious controversies of the time. Vatable came from the "Meaux Cenacle," Wolmar was supposed to hold Luther's ideas on grace, and Beda was well known for his terrible campaigns against the reformers. It was not long before Calvin became more preoccupied with religious questions than with any other. "I was set at the study of law," he says. "No matter how faithfully I forced myself to apply my mind to the subject, God always,

page in the register, at the top of which was written, '*Condemnatio Calvini*.'" Father Lessius, a Jesuit, relates that, having asked to see the registers of the Noyon chapter, he was told: "These registers have been copied and changed; the account of the infamy is omitted" (*Liber de vera capessenda religione*, p. 81). But might not the charge against Calvin be the result of a regrettable confusion? A certain canon, La Vasseur by name, in a work of which only one copy is known to exist (in the British Museum), says that about the middle of the sixteenth century a canon by the name of Jean Cauvin was whipped for a crime of immorality and that, as he thinks, this Cauvin has been confused with the leader of French Protestantism. The registers of the Noyon chapter are lost; there remains (*Bibliothèque nationale, Fonds français*, no. 12032) only a detailed inventory, drawn up in the eighteenth century. It contains this entry: "May 26th, 1534, M. Jean Cauvin was imprisoned at the Corbant gate for a disturbance in the church on the eve of the Holy Trinity." Kampschulte and Paulus, both Catholic historians, do not credit the story of Calvin's infamy. A thorough discussion of this question may be found in Lefranc, *op. cit.*, and Doumergue, *Jean Calvin, les hommes et les choses de son temps*. "The defamatory accusations against Calvin during the whole time that he belonged to the Catholic Church," says Paul Bernard, "rest solely on vague rumors, the origin of which is self-explanatory." (*Etudes*, July 5th, 1909, p. 13.)

in His hidden providence, made me face about in another direction. . . . Having, at that time, received some taste for and knowledge of true piety, I was at once inflamed with so great a desire to profit thereby that, although not altogether abandoning other studies, I attended to them less attentively."

Contemporary evidence shows that from childhood he was serious and studious, but somber, silent, restless, strict with others as also with himself, so ready to suspect and accuse that his comrades called him the "accusative." [6] The "true piety" which seized upon Calvin could not be that living and popular piety of kindly souls, a piety that speaks to the heart, the imagination, and even the senses, recalling the infant Saviour, the Blessed Virgin, the abiding Eucharistic presence of the Saviour in our midst, the redeeming power of the sacrifice of the Mass, the saints crowned with glory and bending down to us, relics and places of pilgrimage preserving the impress of holiness. For the embittered son of the excommunicated lawyer of Noyon, too exclusively devoted to the literary criticism in vogue at the new Collège de France and much impressed by Luther's cry of revolt, "true piety" was, as has been well said, "a reasonable, logical, and, if you prefer, a rational religion—a religion consisting essentially, almost solely, in the adherence of the intellect to truths almost proved, a religion proved, not by the consolations that it brings to afflicted souls, not by the way it fits the needs of human nature, not by the person of God who revealed it to us, nor finally by anything that touches and moves, that consoles and relieves, but by the literalness of its agreement with a text, which is a question of pure philology and, by the solidity of its logical structure, solely a matter of pure reasoning." [7]

---

[6] Doumergue (*op. cit.*) admits that this name was given Calvin by his comrades and he conjectures that it came from the fact that, during his schoolboy days, Calvin was unable to recite a declension beyond the accusative case. Doumergue states that one of Calvin's schoolmates was called "the ablative" because of his tendency to remove articles belonging to others.

Calvin's Teaching

The first manifestation of Calvin's ideas was capable, prudent, calmly prepared and well calculated. Nothing could have been less like the furore caused at Wittenberg seventeen years before by the posting of Luther's public theses on indulgences.

On November 1st, 1533, the new rector of the Paris University, Nicholas Cop, a son of William Cop, the King's physician, on the occasion of the feast of All Saints, delivered a striking discourse on "Christian philosophy," wherein he insisted chiefly on two ideas that were manifestly inspired by Lutheranism: the notion of justification by faith alone and that of an opposition between the Gospel and what the preacher called the Law, *i. e.*, the Church.[8] It soon became known that the sermon was the work of a young tonsured cleric, twenty-four years old, John Cauvin, of Noyon, known among literary men by a recently published commentary on Seneca's *De Clementia.* It was said that he used often to visit the house of a certain compatriot, a rich wine-merchant on rue

---

[7] Brunetière, *Discours de combat,* "L'Œuvre de Calvin." In *Études* (July 5th and 20th, 1909) Paul Bernard surmises that "Calvin's conversion" should be attributed to purely human and personal reasons. In a curious brochure published in 1625 at Rome (Amydeus, *De pietate romana,* p. 191) we read: *"Novi ego Joannem Calvinum, imo cum homine idem diversorium et idem cubiculum sortitus sum, ubi tunc ille noctu narrare cuius esset et quid negotii Parisiis. Judicarunt* (*inquiens*) *judices mihi canonicatum quem impetraveram non adjudicandum, et quidem injuste; sed sentient magno Galliae malo quantus vir est Càluinus."* Without in any way denying the existence or even the preponderance of this motive in Calvin's mind, it seems to us impossible to prescind from the personal tendencies that inclined him toward a rational and individualistic religion, or from his family antecedents, which predisposed him to a struggle against the Church. Cf. *Revue d'Histoire de l'Eglise de France,* January 25th, 1910, p. 115.

[8] Until recently only fragments and summaries of this sermon were known. But in 1872 the complete discourse was discovered in a manuscript in the Strasburg library and published in the *Opera Calvini* (IX, prolegomena, p. lxxiii).

Saint-Martin, Etienne de la Forge by name, where he was wont to meet a group of reformers indoctrinated by Gérard Roussel.

The sermon had been skilfully made up of extracts from various authors; there were to be found attenuated passages from Luther cleverly combined with the most venturesome excerpts from Erasmus.[9] The friendly relations which Nicholas Cop enjoyed at court were no secret. Queen Margaret of Navarre, so it was said, was not a stranger to his appointment. The group of rue Saint-Martin hoped to be sheltered from pursuit, thanks to the influence of Gérard Roussel, the princess' confessor.

But these expectations were not fulfilled. The Cordeliers reported Cop's sermon to Parliament. Cop himself, in his quality of rector, claimed the privilege of being judged in the first instance by the university. Seeing, however, that opinion was divided on this question of procedure, he left France and withdrew to his native Basle in Switzerland. Etienne de la Forge was brought to trial and was burned at the stake on February 16th, 1535. As for Calvin, he was already beyond the frontiers of France. When an order of arrest and summons was issued against him at the Collège de Fortet,[10] where he was staying, it is said he escaped through a window, disguised as a vine-dresser, fled to Saintonge,[11] whence he betook himself to Nérac, where the remains of the "Cenacle of Meaux" were trying to reorganize about the Queen of Navarre.

---

[9] Land, *Die Bekehrung Johannes Calvins,* shows that in this sermon Calvin copied, sometimes word for word, either Erasmus (*Paraclesis,* being the preface to the third edition of his New Testament) or Luther (Sermon for All Saints, 1522). Cf. Doumergue, *op. cit.,* I, p. 336. Some have tried to see in this first attempt an indirect protest against the penalties decreed by the Sorbonne and Parliament. It would have been a very timid and vague protest.

[10] Near the present site of the Pantheon, on the street now called rue Vallet, in Paris.

[11] Jacques Desmay relates that a certain canon of Noyon met Calvin, recognized him, and begged him "to change his manner of life and choose the path of goodness." Calvin replied: "Since I have committed myself, I will keep on; but if I had to begin over, I would not thus commit myself." "Jacques Desmay, a doctor of the Sorbonne and vicar general of Rouen, preaching a Lenten course at Noyon,

The tragical events of 1534 induced Calvin to go to a foreign land. First he went to Strasburg, then, towards the end of the year, to Basle, where he planned to profit by his solitary and hidden life to assemble the ideas of reform that had occupied his mind for so long. The people of Basle must often have wondered who was this pale, somber young man who had come into their midst under the name of Martianus Lucanius and who seemed to be always plunged in deep meditation. It was John Calvin, preparing his "Institutes of the Christian Religion."

The book appeared in Latin in 1536.[12] It was soon translated by the author into French, and was several times revised and enlarged. Luther published numerous pamphlets, letters, and occasional writings, but Calvin condensed his whole doctrine into a single, well thought out work, written in a sober, firm, clear, and precise style, which made it a model of its kind and contributed much to its success. "Calvin," says Bossuet, "wrote as well as any man of his century." The spirit in which the book was conceived corresponded to the aspirations of the men of that time for independence.

An instinctive aversion to any organized Church and traditional dogma, the denial of any intermediary between God and man except the Bible, the reduction of the sacraments to two, Baptism and the Lord's Supper, the efficacy of which was singularly diminished, the condemnation of pious images, holy water, altars, any authority in the teaching of doctrine or the

---

in 1614, there collected *Remarques sur la vie de Jean Calvin,* written without excess of malice or passion." (Lefranc, *op. cit.,* p. xiv.)

[12] *Christianae religionis institutio,* with the famous preface addressed to Francis I. The first French edition appeared at Geneva in 1541. The hypothesis of a French edition before 1536 must be abandoned. (Hauser, *Les sources de l'histoire de France,* VII, 63.)

administration of the Sacraments: such was the negative part of Calvin's scheme, in this sense more radical than the work of Luther, who professed, in his own fashion, at least a belief in the Real Presence and in the efficacy of Baptism. The positive portion of the *Institutio* also took the work of the German reformer for its starting-point. Luther had spoken of the radical corruption of the heart of man; Calvin likewise proclaimed that "the will is in every part so entirely vitiated and depraved that it can produce nothing but what is evil." But he especially insisted that this corruption and the damnation that may result from it are the result of an absolute predestination on the part of God, and said: "Farewell, all the idle observations of many writers concerning preparation." [13] Luther had taught justification by faith, independently of good works, solely by virtue of the imputation of Christ's merits; Calvin writes: "We simply explain justification to be an acceptance, . . . and we say that it consists in the remission of sins and the imputation of the righteousness of Christ." [14] But this imputation he views in an eternal and immutable decree, which renders it incapable of being lost, in such wise that whoever has had grace at a given moment, has it forever, and whoever is predestined to damnation, can do nothing to save himself.[15] Lastly, Luther preached the gratuitousness of divine gifts, independent of any merit of man; Calvin completes the doctrine of gratuity thus understood by that of the absolute good pleasure of God, independent of justice, for justice itself is the work of God's will. And this frightful doctrine of the absolute predestination of man so dominates Calvin's teaching that we may say that if the Lutheran dogma required man to sacrifice his free will and reason, the Calvinist dogma requires him to sacrifice his conscience.[16]

---

[13] *Institutio,* I, p. 26.

[14] *Ibid.,* II, p. 204.

[15] Whereas Luther makes faith a condition of predestination, Calvin makes the latter a condition of faith. Moreover, Luther seems rather concerned with finding a *means* of salvation; Calvin with finding a *certitude* of salvation. See Labauche, *Leçons de théologie dogmatique,* pp. 260, 279, 320.

Calvinism at Geneva

How did it happen that so positive and practical a man as John Calvin fixed upon such a doctrine of despair? We should note that although, on the one hand, the dogma of absolute predestination lowers human nature, on the other hand it remarkably exalts it. To feel themselves forever established in goodness, to know themselves to be the élite of humanity, had a power, among the "predestinated," to greatly increase their energy. If, by the denial of the Real Presence, the temples seemed empty and the ancient liturgical rites purposeless, "this very fact," says Bossuet, "was a new charm for certain lofty minds, who thought themselves, by this means, raised above the senses and distinguished from the vulgar crowd." [17] It is not without good reason that some have reproached Calvin and others have praised him for having "aristocratized" religion.[18]

---

[16] Says Buisson: "Catholicism required man to sacrifice his reason [?]; Calvin required him to sacrifice his conscience. He exacts the adoration of the divine pleasure as supremely just." (Lavisse and Rambaud, IV, p. 524.)

[17] Bossuet, *Variations*, bk. 9.

[18] Brunetière (*op. cit.*) gives a broader meaning to this word "aristocratize," as he does to "intellectualize" and "individualize," when he applies it to Calvin's religion. From this point of view it was quite just to remark that "in Calvin's religion the illiterate as well as the learned are called, since it is sufficient that they believe in the preaching of the pastors; if, in the *Institutio*, anything is forcibly inculcated, it is the obligation of bowing before the impenetrable mysteries of religion; Calvin, while rejecting the doctrine of the Communion of Saints in the sense held by the Catholic Church, admitted a visible church, the members of which constitute the mystical body of Christ, and which is united by fraternal charity." (Paul Dudon in *Études*, December 5th, 1909, pp. 677 sq.) It remains no less true, as has been said, that in a very real sense Calvin, by setting up his private interpretation in opposition to the Church, not merely for an almost entirely negative work like Luther's, but to define a symbol, to organize a form of public worship, to form a government, anathematize the so-called papal errors, did, more than Luther, show himself intellectual, aristocratic, and individualistic.

The terrible doctrine was, then, able to gather about its master a group of men who were ready for any undertaking, devoted even unto death, unmoved by suffering to the point of insensibility, ardent to the point of fanaticism. With their aid Calvin made the first attempt at a society dominated by his principles in the city of Geneva.

Geneva, an ancient Swiss city, which gloried in tracing its history back to the Romans, and in having fought, throughout the Middle Ages, for the autonomy of its Burgundian traditions against its own bishops and the counts and dukes of Savoy, was passing through a political and religious crisis at the very time when the *Institutio* appeared. The town council, excommunicated by the bishop, at strife with the dukes of Savoy, had just formed itself, with the support of the cantons of Fribourg and Bern, into a Great Council, and had proclaimed Geneva a free city under the nominal protectorate of the German Empire. The leaders of this independence movement, until then called "Libertins," had, in consequence of their union with Fribourg and Bern, taken the name of "Confederates," in German "Eidgenossen," whence is undoubtedly derived the name of "Huguenots." But the people of Bern, already won over to the Lutheran ideas, had taken advantage of their political influence and the rupture of the city with the bishop, to admit the new ideas. On August 27th, 1535, the Great Council abolished the exercise of the Catholic religion at Geneva and opened its gates to all the reformers who were being brought to trial by Christian princes.

The Reformation had, moreover, certain men of intellectual ability at Geneva. William Farel and one of his friends, a Dauphinois named Saunier, had come a few months previously, fortified with letters patent from the Bernese authorities, licensing them "to teach any person whatsoever, of any age or sex, the reading and writing of French." These two reformers had preached their doctrines openly. Farel was promoter of the law of August 27th, 1535; he was the most active worker for the tyrannical measures that followed: the closing of convents, the expulsion of religious, confiscation of church property, and threats against the Catholic laity. There was uneasiness on all sides. Many peaceful citizens left the city, while reformers, driven from France, came in large numbers.

It was under these circumstances that John Calvin came to Geneva. Although he was barely twenty-seven years old, his thin features, white hair, and slightly bent posture, and the somber gravity of his eyes gave him almost the appearance of an old man. The report of his misfortunes, of his relations with eminent persons at court, and of the great work which he had just composed in defense of the new doctrines, increased his prestige. His imperious voice and abrupt gestures indicated a man accustomed to command and determined to be obeyed without question. Geneva, abandoned as it was, had need of a dictator.

Calvin, who, after the manner of the reformers, had just drawn up a whole set of doctrines, was in need of a temporal power to impose them. To seek the aid of a secular prince, as Luther did, was dangerous; to hope for such aid from the king of France, so prepossessed with the powers which the concordat of 1516 gave him over persons and property of the Church, was chimerical. But Geneva, a free city, where politics and religion were now closely united, where the ruler could easily govern State and Church at the same time with dictatorial power, seemed to be a suitable field for experiment, where Protestantism might try its strength. Calvin, a consummate politician, possessed to an equal degree the gift of seeing what possibilities could be realized and the gift of knowing how to wait for them patiently. For five years he let Geneva struggle in anarchy, call upon him as its savior, and reject him only to call on him again. In the autumn of 1541, after long prayer, aware of his strength and Geneva's need of him, he installed himself, if not as official head of the republic, at least as the chief councillor, without whom nothing might be done.

The first of his cares was to call to Geneva all Frenchmen who were persecuted by the Parliament. Of these partisans the most devoted formed a sort of body-guard, following him everywhere. The Bernese and Genevan pastors, subjected to the irresistible dominance of his personality, no longer thought or legislated save according to his will. Under the name of "Consistory," a body of elders, recalling the *"episcopi"* or "overseers" of the early Church and the "censors" of ancient Rome, organized an inquisitorial vigilance over the citizens and denounced infractions of the moral law as social crimes. As the Protestant historian Leopold von Ranke says, "outward life was subjected to regulations of the strictest discipline. The amount to be spent on clothes and meals was fixed; dancing was forbidden, as was the reading of certain books, for example, *Amadis*. Card players might be seen set in the pillory, with their cards in their hands. Once a year, an inquiry was made in every house as to the knowledge and observance of religious precepts. There was introduced into the Council the practice of reciprocal admonition for the failings that one member might observe in another. No indulgence was extended to offenders. One woman was burned for singing indecent songs; one of the principal burghers, who had made fun of the doctrine of salvation and of the person of the great preacher, had to kneel down in the public square, holding an inverted torch, and to ask pardon before the people. On the proposal of the general assembly, the death penalty was enacted for adultery; a man, convicted under this law, when about to be executed, had to bless God for the stern laws of his country." [19]

---

[19] Ranke, *Histoire de France pendant les XVI^e et XVII^e siècles,* I, p. 164. Hauser considers this tyrannical legislation as a reaction against the mode of living of the "libertines" and humanists. (*Études sur la Réformation française,* pp. 55–65.)

The most celebrated case of capital punishment at Geneva by order of Calvin was that of Michel Servet. This man, a Spanish physician, had dared to write the counterpart of the *Christianae Religionis Institutio* under the title of *Restitutio Christiana.* Therein were found heresies on the Trinity, among others a denial of the consubstantiality of the Father and the Son. Calvin, unable to lay hands on his contradictor, did not hesitate to denounce him to the Catholic Inquisition. Servet was arrested in France by order of Cardinal de Tournon, but escaped. He had the imprudence to pass by way of Geneva. There he was promptly seized, condemned, and on October 27th, 1553, burned at the stake.[20] The next year, by way of justifying himself, Calvin published a *Déclaration pour maintenir la vraye foy, . . . où est montré qu'il est licite de punir les hérétiques.*[21] The principal leaders of Protestantism in Germany and France declared themselves in accord with Calvin's act. Bucer and Melanchthon expressed approval of Servet's execution. When Sebastian Castellion, a former friend of Calvin, attacked the doctrine of the repression of heresy. Theodore de Bèze took up his pen and defended the inquisitorial system in a special work that was published by Robert Estienne under the title, *De haereticis a civili magistratu puniendis.*

---

[20] See Bouvier, *La question Michel Servet.*

[21] "A declaration in support of the true faith . . . in which it is shown that it is permitted to punish heretics." (Calvin, *Opera,* IX, pp. 70, 92.)

CHAPTER IX

Protestantism in France

THE Protestant communities thenceforth founded in France took the Geneva organization for a model: a council of elders, called the Consistory, the election of pastors by the laity, regular meetings at which, after a reading from the Scriptures, there followed an exhortation and the singing of Psalms. They used to write to Geneva for Calvin's advice and even asked him for pastors. In this way were established the Reformed Church of Pré-aux-Clercs at Paris and the Reformed churches at Meaux, Angers, Poitiers, Bourges, Blois, and Tours. The names "Huguenots" and (more usually) "Calvinists" were given to Calvin's disciples. France, which had only one Protestant in 1522, counted 400,000 Protestants in 1559.[1] Calvin had given them their doctrine at Basle and their organization at Geneva.

Henry II against the Huguenots

Organized, militant, gathered about a man of unquestioned leadership and superior ability, Calvinism became a danger to Church and State.

Francis I died on March 31st, 1547, at the age of 53 years. His successor, Henry II, being an artist and a man of letters, was allied to the world of humanists from which the reformers were recruited, but on the day of his coronation, on taking possession of the throne, he took his oath "to wipe out heresy and to do so in such wise that posterity might say: 'If Henry

---

[1] This is the figure given by Theodore de Bèze and accepted by historians.

II had not reigned, the Church would have perished.' " From the death of Francis I to that of Henry II, the four virtuous pontiffs who occupied the see of Peter were Paul III, Julius III, Marcellus II, and Paul IV. They asked nothing better than to back up the King's action by their authority. Unfortunately conflicts over questions of jurisdiction obstructed the coöperation of the Holy See with the royal authority which a mutual understanding would have rendered effective. Strange though it may seem, no one was keener in urging Henry II to employ severe measures against heretics than Diana of Poitiers, an enigmatic woman much older than the King, who undertook "to train him in honor and manly virtues," yet seems to have played the sad rôle of a favorite.

One of Henry's first acts was to create a commission—the famous Chambre Ardente—in the Parliament of France to judge heresy cases. This commission sat from 1547 to 1550 and issued 66 death sentences.[2] The edict of 1551, known as that of Châteaubriant, codified in 46 articles all the measures taken against the Lutherans and regulated the juridical procedure in these cases. But at times most regrettable scenes occurred. If we are to credit Jean Crépin's *Acta martyrum,* one day in the Louvre, during the trial of a tailor accused of heresy, Diana of Poitiers, who was often present on such occasions, uttered some remark. "Madame," roughly replied the Paris workman, "be satisfied with having infected France without introducing your filth into so holy a thing as religion." On the morrow, Henry II went to see the execution. "But," says the annalist, "the condemned man turned upon the King a look so piercing that the latter was obliged to withdraw and was so deeply moved that it seemed to him he was followed by this man."

Such scandals would have been avoided if the King and the Parliament of Paris had heeded the voice of the Council of Trent in its protest against the intrusion of secular tribunals into religious cases and the voice of Pope Paul IV proposing to Henry the introduction of the Inquisition. The result would have been a more orderly procedure, freer from court influences and more competently conducted. Paul IV did, by Bull, appoint three French cardinals as chief inquisitors.[3] But the Parliament, imbued with Gallican ideas and distrustful of Rome, obstinately resisted. Ecclesiastical courts, it was said, would not be severe enough. As they could not inflict the death penalty, their work of repression would be ineffective. The Inquisition edict was officially registered, but never carried out. Parliament preserved its pretended right to exercise a more severe justice.

---

[2] Weiss, *La chambre ardente.*

On the contrary, it was, in fact, becoming more and more tolerant. At the very moment when the civil magistracy was arrogating to itself the sole right to try heresy cases, heresy was entering its bosom.

The famous lawyer, Dumoulin, in 1552 published his *Commentarius ad edictum Henrici II, contra parvas datas et abusus curiae Romanae,*[4] taking to task the pope and the Roman chancery. This gave rise to violent polemics, in the course of which Dumoulin went so far as to maintain that "the pope is the great beast of the Apocalypse, that the Bible is the sole rule of faith, and that communion under both species is necessary for all the faithful."

Such propositions were notoriously heretical and gave public scandal. Dumoulin was one of the most eminent lawyers of the day. His treatise *De dividuo et individuo,* the substance of which was appropriated by Pothier in his *Traité des Obligations,* placed him in the first rank among his colleagues. Many of these undertook his defense. This was the starting-point of an evolution of Parliament towards Protestantism and was destined to have fatal consequences.

---

[3] Guise, Bourbon, and Châtillon.

[4] When an ecclesiastic wished to resign a benefice, he directed his request to Rome. It seems that it became an established custom to give two dates to the resignation: the "Great Date," indicating the day when the pope registered the request at Rome, and the "Little Date," indicating the day of its registration by subordinate officials. The existence of these two dates gave rise to abuses, which were, however, soon suppressed by the popes. (See *Mémoirs du clergé de France,* XII, pp. 889–899.)

In 1558 Marot's "Psalms" were sung in the open air at Pré-aux-Clercs, and among the singers were Antoine de Bourbon, king of Navarre, and the Prince de Condé. In May, 1559, representatives of the fifty reformed churches of France met in a house in the Faubourg Saint-Germain and drew up the "Confession of Faith of the French Churches." [5]

A certain number of magistrates decided to employ rigorous measures. But Parliament was divided. The two chambers were at odds. The Grand Chambre, having extraordinary jurisdiction, being successor to the Chambre Ardente, wanted to apply the Compiègne edict with severity; but the Tournelle, or chamber of ordinary jurisdiction, preferred to inflict only light penalties or even to dismiss the pleas. This latter chamber, presided over by Pierre Séguier and de Harlay, counted Christophe de Thou among its members. Among those in favor of severe repression may be named the first president, Gilles Le Maître, and Presidents Minard and de Saint-André.

To put an end to the conflict, it was decided to meet once a week. After six weeks of discussion, it was evident that the partisans of tolerance were in the majority. The Cardinal of Lorraine then counselled the King to launch a bold stroke. On June 15th, 1559, Henry II, with a numerous suite, including the princes of Bourbon and the three Guises, appeared before Parliament. Bertrandi, keeper of the seals, spoke. "The King," he said, "commands you to continue freely in his presence your deliberations on the penalties to be inflicted on heretics." Minard, Saint-André, and Le Maître spoke in favor of the edicts. Then came the others' turn. Louis du Faur, looking directly at Henry II, said to him: "Do you fear lest it be said to you, as Elias formerly said to Achab: 'You it is that disturbs Israel?' " And Christophe de Thou declared: "In matters of this sort, Parliament is supreme, the king's men have no right to interfere." Arnaud du Ferrier proposed that "the matter should be deferred to a meeting of a general council." At length Anne du Bourg said: "I know there are certain crimes that ought to be punished without mercy, such as adultery, blasphemy, debauchery. But are we to consider it a slight matter to condemn men who invoke the name of Jesus Christ in the midst of flames?" This was an open apology for the Protestants. The King indignantly arose and ordered Montmorency to seize the guilty councillors on the spot. The constable descended the steps, seized the men indicated, and delivered them to Montgomery, captain of the guard, who brought them to the Bastille.

---

[5] The text of this Confession of Faith may be found in Bèze, *Histoire ecclésiastique,* I, pp. 173–190.

Some days later, President Minard, returning on his mule from the royal palace, when nearing his house on rue Vieille-du-Temple, was killed by an arquebus shot. The people suspected the Calvinists of having done this out of revenge for the arrest of du Bourg and the other councillors. The Protestants took upon themselves to confirm these suspicions, by singing when the Cardinal of Lorraine passed by:

"Garde-toi, cardinal,
Que tu ne sois traité
A la minarde
D'une stuarde." [6]

---

[6] The name "stuardes" was given to poisoned pills, which it was rumored that James Stuart used.

France under the Rule of Factions

The King, on his return to the Louvre after the famous council of June 15th, 1559, was beside himself. He is reported to have said that he would go to see du Bourg burned with his own eyes. A few days afterwards, Montgomery's lance overthrew him in a tournament. His successor, Francis II, was a young man of fifteen, delicate, sickly, and taciturn. He ruled scarcely seventeen months and left the throne to a child, nine or ten years old, Charles IX. The Guises, uncles of King Francis II by his wife Mary Stuart, seized control. From that time until the coming of Henry IV the monarchical government was, so to speak, in suspense. The direction of affairs was entirely in the hands of parties, which necessarily grouped themselves according to their religious ideas. It has justly been said that "1559 marks the close of an era . . . There is no longer any international policy, strictly so called . . . Italian question, Spanish question, German question, Navarre question—all these are in the background. It is the hour when Charles V disappears, when Henry II and Mary Tudor die. The cause of orthodoxy is represented by Philip II, that of the Reformation by Elizabeth. Between the two, Europe will be divided for forty years."[7] The same division and the same point of view will naturally force itself on the internal policy of France. As against the house of the Guises, which will support the Catholic party, the house of Bourbon will declare itself for the Protestants: between the two a third party will be formed, made up of undecided, fluctuating followers, actuated by policy, as Catherine de' Medici, Henry II's widow, or by family reasons, as Montmorency, or by principle, as Chancellor Michel de l'Hôpital. Francis II's reign will assure the predominance of the Catholic party by the Guises; the beginning of Charles IX's reign will favor the third party, that of de l'Hôpital; but the chancellor's policy will assure the triumph of the Protestant party, of the Bourbons, which, by provoking the Vassy massacre, will let loose, under Charles IX and Henry III, a thirty years' civil war.

---

[7] Henri Lemonnier in Lavisse, *Histoire de France,* V. p. 181.

The Guises, or Lorraines, as their enemies called them to emphasize their foreign origin, prided themselves on their descent from Claude, duke of Guise, who was made duke and peer for having saved France from the invasion of the Rustauds. The then head of the family, Francis, surnamed the Great Duke of Guise, by his taking of Calais in 1558, had just completed, after a century's interval, the work of Joan of Arc, by driving the English entirely from French soil. Wherever he appeared, he was acclaimed with popular enthusiasm. His friends were fond of recalling that, while he was French by the services of his family and his own, he was likewise so by his chivalrous character. Later on it will be told how, at the siege of Metz, he was seen aiding the poor, and how his example led his companions to do likewise. His brother, the cardinal, raised to the highest ecclesiastical dignities while still very young, a prelate of lofty conduct, employed his great influence for the good of science and of the Church. To him is due the creation of the University of Rheims and the first attempts at seminaries in France. Both of them came of that great stock of which the Maréchale de Retz said: "These Lorraine princes have such fine features that other princes seem like common people beside them."

The house of Bourbon traced its origin back to St. Louis through his sixth son, Robert. It was represented by three brothers: Antoine de Bourbon, king of Navarre, who was soon pushed towards militant Protestantism by his wife, Jeanne d'Albret; Cardinal Charles de Bourbon, at first favorable to the Calvinists, but later turned by circumstances against the Protestant party and proclaimed king of France by the leaguers at the death of Henry III; and the Prince de Condé, a decided Huguenot, already compromised by having publicly sung Marot's Psalms at the Pré-aux-Clercs. Condé was small, ill-favored, slightly hump-backed, but active in all bodily exercises, brave, intelligent; it was he who, at the coming of Francis II, seeing the favor accorded the Lorraine princes, placed himself at the head of the malcontents.

The Prince de Condé, by his marriage to Eléonore de Roye, in 1551, became allied to the house of Châtillon or Coligny, already won over to Protestantism in the person of several of its members. Of these the most celebrated was Admiral Gaspard de Coligny. Born in 1517, he became noted as a brave soldier and especially as a leader of grim calmness, stern severity, at times of dreadful coldness towards his subordinates when discipline was at stake. As the influence of Diana of Poitiers removed him from the command of an army sent to Italy, he kept, throughout Henry II's reign, a resentment against the court. In 1559 he openly declared himself a Huguenot. Soon after he played an important part in the religious wars.[8]

The third party was represented chiefly by the Queen Mother, Catherine de' Medici, and by the Chancellor, Michel de l'Hôpital.

---

[8] The Admiral had been brought to embrace Protestantism by the influence of his young brother Francis, better known as Dandelot. He was imprisoned in 1551 and during his imprisonment he read Calvin's works, which produced a deep impression on him. This impression he communicated to his two brothers. The elder, Odet, known as Cardinal de Châtillon, did not exert any great political influence. But his strange career is noteworthy, as indicative of the customs of the time. He was born in 1515, became a cardinal when eighteen years old, archbishop of Toulouse the next year, then, a year later, bishop of Beauvais. He led a rather worldly life. When he openly declared himself a Huguenot, after the death of Henry II, Pope Paul IV excommunicated him. He dressed in red for his public marriage with Elizabeth de Hauteville, whom he presented at court, where she was commonly called Madame la Cardinale or the Countess of Beauvais. In the religious wars he fought in his brothers' army, then went to England, where he was well received by Queen Elizabeth.

Catherine de' Medici is often pictured as a restless, insincere, intriguing woman. The recent publication of her extensive correspondence[9] has made it possible to test this traditional estimate. Henry II's widow was a practical and intelligent woman who seems constantly to have aimed at maintaining the king's authority and the peace of the realm.[10] This was no slight task. Catherine sought to gain this end, now by the use of broad tolerance and now by a wavering policy. Overmuch swayed by the counsels of her fellow-countryman, Machiavelli, she too often was indifferent as to whether the means of attaining her purposes were fair or foul. Frequently these means were lying and, at least once, murder.

With this policy of the Queen Mother we cannot absolutely identify that of her most trusted adviser, Michel de l'Hôpital. He was outspoken, cold, and blunt, "another Cato the Censor," says Brantôme; "with his long white beard, pale face, and solemn manners, he had quite the appearance of one." His fondness for rules and regulations went to the point of being a mania. Never did a chancellor publish more edicts upon a greater variety of subjects. His compatriots questioned the sincerity of his Catholicism. "We mistrust," they said, "the Constable's paternoster, the Admiral's toothpick, and the Chancellor's Mass." [11] From an examination of his correspondence and of his deeds it would appear that Michel de l'Hôpital[12] was not a Protestant in disguise, but a legist, or rather a "doctrinaire," a "liberal Catholic"—if by anticipation we may apply to him these terms of another period. For him, religion was purely a personal matter, not a question of the social order; the Church is no concern of the State, nor the State of the Church. His religious tolerance bore a very close resemblance to indifference. "Give up those fiendish names," he said, "the symbols of parties, factions, and seditions, Lutherans, Huguenots, Papists. Let us not change the name of Christian." [13]

---

[9] The publication of Catherine de' Medici's correspondence was begun by de la Ferrière and continued by Baguenault de Puchesse.

[10] *Revue des Questions Historiques,* 1885, pp. 551 sq.

[11] It is related that Montmorency used to say his beads while considering some severe orders and that Coligny was found plying a toothpick whenever he had some serious move in mind.

[12] See his *Letters,* published in 1778.

At the side of Catherine de' Medici and Chancellor de l'Hôpital was Constable Montmorency, a Catholic at heart, but allied with the Bourbons. He began by practicing the third party's policy, though later he lined up with the Guises.

It is not our purpose to recount the political strife of these latter with the malcontent faction, the conspiracy of Amboise, rendered abortive by the arrest and execution of La Renaudie, Antoine de Bourbon's negotiations with Queen Elizabeth of England and the Protestant princes of Germany, the arrest and condemnation of Condé and his liberation by Francis II's death in 1560, Catherine's policy, dictated by the Bourbon interests, the appeal to the Council by Antoine de Bourbon, Coligny, and Montmorency, and that measure which led to the edict (February 24th, 1561) by virtue of which the imprisoned reformers were to be released, the banished recalled, and all heresy trials discontinued. All these liberal measures were on condition of a return to Catholicism. But this stipulation was never applied.

This edict of amnesty, instead of appeasing the Calvinists, exalted them. Their aim then became evident: what they wanted in France, as at Geneva, was not freedom but domination. In April, 1561, they held an assembly in the very halls of Parliament. Numerous writings called upon the government to carry out the religious reformation. At Paris, in the faubourg Saint-Marcel and outside the Saint-Antoine gate, they preached furiously against the papacy. In the provinces they drove out the priests and seized the churches. Baron des Adrets terrorized the Midi.

---

[13] From an address (December 13th, 1560) to the Orleans States General. (Cf. Felice, p. 92.)

Again Chancellor de l'Hôpital had recourse to one of his chimeras: to bring about an agreement between Catholics and Protestants by trying to harmonize the two doctrines. At the invitation of the Queen Regent conferences were held in the refectory of the old monastery of Poissy in September and October, 1561. With the little King Charles IX presiding over the meetings, Theodore de Bèze and Peter Martyr spoke in behalf of the Protestants, while the Cardinal of Lorraine espoused the cause of the Catholics. These conferences have become known to history as the "Colloquy of Poissy." At the end, both Catholics and Protestants departed more exasperated than they were at the beginning.[14]

A like result obtained from an edict, issued at Saint-Germain-en-Laye (January 17th, 1562), which conditionally authorized Protestant public worship and meetings.[15] It dissatisfied both the Catholics, who were irritated at seeing heretical worship thus officially protected, and the Protestants, who were expecting greater favors. At Montpellier, at Castres, in fact more or less everywhere, the Calvinists invaded the churches, seized the bells, and smashed the altars.[16] In January, 1562, Theodore de Bèze wrote to Calvin that one could not imagine to what a degree the Huguenots' fury had risen in the Midi. "The Aquitanians," he said, "will not be satisfied until they exterminate their foes." Ronsard, in his *Discours sur les misères du temps,* reproached the reformers for preaching "a Christ carrying a pistol and all blackened with smoke." [17]

---

[14] Th. de Bèze, *Hist. Eccl.,* I, pp. 500–665.

[15] *Ibid.,* pp. 674–681.

[16] See an article by Louis Batiffol in *Revue hebdomadaire,* November, 1908.

[17] Ronsard, *Œuvres complètes* (Marty-Laveaux ed.), V, p. 336. The original edition was published in 1562. See Leclercq, *Les martyrs,* VII, pp. 175–183. Cf. Verstegan, *Theatrum crudelitatum haereticorum nostri temporis.* On Ronsard's at-

The Catholics, on their part, at times employed similar reprisals. At Paris they invaded a house where a preaching service was going on and destroyed the furniture.

At this stage the Connétable de Montmorency, deeming religion in danger, aligned himself with the party of the Guises. François de Guise, Montmorency, and Saint-André formed a pact, constituting a sort of triumvirate. Cardinal de Tournon joined it. Philip II of Spain, the Duke of Savoy, and the Pope did not hide their gratification at this news. The situation became more tense than ever. It needed only a spark to start a general war. At Vassy on the Champagne frontier, (March 1st, 1562), the Duke of Guise, returning from Saverne to Paris with an escort of two hundred horsemen, met a body of four or five hundred Protestants. After mutual provocations, they came to blows, and blood flowed. The casualties amounted to sixty men killed and two hundred wounded. The affair was magnified and worked up. Everyone talked of "the Vassy massacre." Thereafter the January edict was regarded as a dead letter. Wherever the Protestants were the stronger, they seized churches; where the Catholics had the upper hand, they proscribed the Protestants. François, duke of Guise, on his arrival in Paris, was acclaimed king with shouts of "Vive Guise!" The Protestants gathered in arms about their leaders. The two parties got ready to test each other's strength on the field of battle.

It does not enter into the plan of this narrative to detail the various incidents of the religious wars that crimsoned the soil of France at the end of the sixteenth century. These episodes have their proper place in the history of France.

A strange fact strikes us when we consider the picture of these religious strifes as a whole: the Protestants, nearly

---

titude toward the Protestants and the causes of it, see Strowski, *Saint François de Sales, Introduction à l'histoire du sentiment religieux en France au XVII^e^ siècle*, pp. 13 sqq.

always worsted on the field of battle, are always favored in the treaties. "We constantly beat the Huguenots in arms," says Montluc, "but thereupon they beat us by their devilish writings." The key to this fact is found in Catherine de' Medici's policy: to prevent the triumph of parties and to govern by keeping them balanced, she always took up the defense of the weaker party. When she saw the Protestant faction about to win the hegemony, through the dominance of Coligny over the young King, she crushed it by a terrible stroke.

St. Bartholomew's Day

The account of this sad episode and of the formation of the League and an exposition of the Edict of Nantes which put an end to so many wars, must now receive our attention.

The founder of French Protestantism, worn out by diseases and ceaseless activity, slowly expired on May 27th, 1564. With his health undermined by disease of head and stomach, by gout, gall stones, and asthma, John Calvin kept preaching, writing, dogmatizing, expending his extraordinary energy in prodigious activities, living to his very last days—to use his own words—*in tumultu et festinatione*. At his death he left his followers a set of doctrines, an organization, and, what is more, a spirit of haughty independence, unconquerable revolt, and obstinate combativeness, not so much for the defense of individual liberty as for the conquest of power. This spirit lived in Calvin's successors. Theodore de Bèze kept it in his sermons, Coligny carried it into the military camps.

Three successive campaigns, brought to an end, the first by the treaty of Amboise (1563), the second by the peace of Longjumeau (1568), and the third by the peace of Saint-Germain-en-Laye (1570), resulted in giving the Protestants the free public exercise of their religion throughout the kingdom, except Paris, admitting them to public office, and four places of refuge: La Rochelle, Montauban, Cognac, and La Charité-sur-Loire. The party of the Guises sank, while Henry of Navarre obtained the hand of Margaret of Valois, sister of King Charles IX (1572), and Coligny was admitted to court, where he became all-powerful. Catherine observed that her unwise policy of compensations, granted to the reformers, had exceeded reasonable bounds. The assassination of the Duke of Guise by the Protestant Poltrot de Méré (1563), then the massacre of Nîmes (September 29th, 1567),[18] in which 120 Catholics were cruelly slaughtered, and almost at the same time Condé's daring attempt to capture the court (September 25th, 1567) showed how far the boldness of the Huguenots might go.

This last affair maddened the young King. "No one is going to give me any more such frights," said Charles IX with more oaths than necessary, according to the account given by Bouchefort in a letter to Renée de Ferrare. "I will enter their houses and penetrate to their very beds to look for those who give me these alarms." The peace of Saint-Germain, by granting the Protestants four fortified strongholds, formed, as it were, a State within the State, capable of contracting foreign alliances.[19] This was well calculated to increase their audacity. The people, taken as a whole, "regarded the Protestants as sacrilegious infidels, savages, enemies of human society," [20] and were ready to applaud any measure of stern repression taken against them.

The saintly Pope Pius V, who took possession of the Holy

---

[18] Vaisette, *Histoire de Languedoc,* V, p. 289.

[19] "Nearly all the Protestants wanted the German princes to be asked for prompt and ample assistance." (Bèze, II, p. 35.) Condé and Coligny treated with the English, as is evidenced by their correspondence. In 1561 Coligny had some meetings with Trockmorton in the Fontainebleau forest. At these interviews Coligny revealed what had taken place in the royal council and thus informed Queen Elizabeth. (Laferrière, *Le XVI^e^ siècle et les Valois,* p. 52.)

[20] Lavallée, *Histoire des français,* I, p. 560.

See in 1565, repeatedly called the attention of Christian rulers, particularly Charles IX, to the Protestant danger and the need of meeting it.[21] Statesmen, mindful of the traditional policy of the monarchy, remembered that one of its most important traditions had ever been to repress heresies,[22] that King Charles IX, like all his ancestors, had, on his coronation day, sworn to defend the religious unity of the realm. The circumstances called for grave measures.

Coligny, having attained the summit of power and having won the complete confidence of the young King, who called him "my father," planned nothing less than a change in the orientation of French policy. To oppose Spain by an alliance with the Protestant princes of Germany was his aim. The Catholic leaders were alarmed at the prospect of an army of Protestants commanded by Coligny. "Madame," said Tavannes to the queen mother, "if anyone offers you such advice, you ought to have his head cut off." [23] Catherine foiled the admiral's projects. "God grant, Madame," said he, "that you be not overtaken by another war, from which you will be unable to withdraw!"

The presence in Paris of numerous Protestants who came for the marriage of Henry of Navarre to Margaret of Valois (August 18th, 1572) and their insolent conduct irritated the city population. A popular song exhorted the people to "work wonders" by making this a "red marriage." About eleven o'clock on the morning of August 22nd, while the Admiral on his return from the Louvre was passing through a little street between rue des Fossés-Saint-Germain and the quay, an arquebus shot, coming from behind a window curtain, cut off the first finger of his right hand and lodged in his arm.

---

[21] Falloux, *Vie de saint Pie V*, pp. 203, 208, 217–219.

[22] The French tradition in this matter may be seen in the scholarly work of Thomassin, *Traité dogmatique et historique des édits et autres moyens dont on s'est servi pour établir et maintenir l'unité de l'Eglise.*

[23] Laferrière, *Lettres de Catherine de' Medici*, IV, pp. lxvi sqq.

Much feeling was aroused. The King himself paid a visit to the injured Admiral. "The wound is yours," said the King, "the pain is mine." A chronicler [24] reports that the Admiral profited by the occasion to take the young King aside and warn him to distrust his mother. But Catherine, by dint of much insistence, drew from the King the secret of this meeting: her irritation against the Admiral was at its height.

The excitement of the Protestants increased. In the little courtyard of the house on the rue de Bétisy, where the Admiral lived, a crowd gathered and remarks like this were heard: "That arm will cost thirty thousand other arms." That evening, Bouchavannes, having overheard certain proposals at the same place, reported at the Louvre that the Huguenots had decided to attack the King in his palace "on the morrow at supper time." This threat provoked mad rage at court. Catherine summoned the King's council. All were of opinion that no alternative was open but to strike or perish, that the King, being supreme judge and the source of all jurisdiction, had a right, by virtue of his title, to have all disturbers of the peace seized, condemned, and executed, and that the hour had come to exercise this right.

But Charles himself had first to be brought to this same frame of mind. For more than two hours Catherine begged, implored, threatened, tortured him, fiercely strove to stir up in that sickly, irritable little being a tempest of rage, a nervous crisis, in the midst of which she might extract from him the order which she needed and which the King would doubtless have refused in cooler moments. The councillors added their entreaties to those of the Queen. In a moment of fevered excitation, the young King cried: "Very well then, since you wish it, kill them all, kill them all!"

That was enough. The provost of trade, Le Charron, received orders to seize the keys of all the city gates, to stop all boats on the Seine, and to place the city militia under arms. Marcel, former provost, a man who held the populace in his hand, was summoned to the Louvre. He replied that twenty thousand men, drawn up in twenty quarters of Paris, would hold themselves in readiness all night to receive orders from their chiefs. The houses of Protestants would be marked with chalk. About an hour before dawn, at sound of the tocsin at the Palace of Justice, they would descend upon the designated houses.

---

[24] *Collection de documents inédits sur l'histoire de France, Correspondance de Catherine de' Medici.*

Catherine, fearing perhaps that the King might recoil at the last moment, advanced the hour. On her own authority, at about two o'clock in the morning, she ordered the ringing of the tocsin at Saint-Germain-l'Auxerrois, the church nearest the Louvre. It was August 24th, the feast of St. Bartholomew.

As had been agreed upon, the first victim was Coligny. A certain Besme, a German officer in the service of Guise, forced the outer gate, slew the porter, took his keys, and, accompanied by his men, broke into the Admiral's apartment. The latter had risen from bed at sound of the soldiers' tumult. Clad in a dressing-gown, not doubting the death that awaited him, he began reciting his prayers. "Are you the Admiral?" asks Besme. "Yes." At this reply, Besme plunged his sword into the Admiral's bosom. Soldiers seized him and threw him out of the window while still breathing. Guise and Angoulême were waiting in the street. The latter dismounted from his horse, leaned over the corpse, and said: "It is he." Guise's followers then cried: "Kill the rest of them now! The King commands it!" and they scattered to the various quarters of the city.

The populace, recruited by Marcel, rose up on all sides and, according to Tavannes' expression, "death and blood flowed in the streets." At eleven o'clock in the morning, shooting and sacking were still going on. Charles IX tried to put an end to the massacre and pillage. Mounted archers patroled the streets. In the afternoon the tumult subsided, but scenes of murder were renewed on the 25th, 26th, and 27th of August. Unauthorized bands profited by the disturbance to steal and plunder. Men laid hold on their personal enemies, their rivals, on those whose wealth they coveted, and made them pass for Protestants. "To have money," declares Mézeray, "or to hold an enviable position, or to have hungry heirs, was to be a Huguenot."

Like scenes were enacted outside of Paris, at Meaux August 25th, at Angers on the 29th, at Lyons on the 30th, at Bourges on September 15th, at Rouen on the 17th, at Toulouse on the 23rd, at Bordeaux on October 3rd, at Poitiers on the 27th. In some of these cases, the movement may have been prompted by instructions more or less secret; but for the most part the uprising was spontaneous.

Efforts have been made to ascertain the number of Protestants done to death in the St. Bartholomew's Day massacre. It seems impossible to determine the number outside of Paris. In Paris itself it could not have exceeded two thousand.[25]

---

[25] This is the figure accepted by Ranke, Henri Marin, Lavisse and Rambaud (*Histoire générale,* V, p. 145), and Batiffol (*The Century of the Renaissance,* p. 234). Among contemporaries we find the following estimates: de Thou says 2000; the Venetian ambassador Micheli, from 2000 to 4000; d'Aubigné, 3000; Brantôme, 4000; Mézeray, 5000. The Protestant martyrology places the figure at 10,000, but enumerates only 468 by name. Caveirac, in his *Apologie de Louis XIV, suivie d'une dissertation sur la Saint-Barthélemy,* p. lxiii, published a document that can supply a basis for probable evaluation: it is a note of the grave-diggers for the burial of eleven hundred bodies taken from the Seine. Since it is likely that most of the bodies were thrown into the Seine, that the greater number of them were recovered, and that the grave-diggers would not have reduced the number in their report, the estimate of 2000 as the number of victims seems correct. Moreover, we should not forget that, according to a remark by Mézeray, a certain number of Catholics were among those who perished in the massacre. The story that Charles IX shot at the Protestants with an arquebus from a window of the Louvre has no historical foundation. (Loiseleur, *Trois énigmes historiques,* pp. 108–116.) As for the clergy, it is worthy of note that not one of them took part in the council that decided on the St. Bartholomew slaughter, that in several provinces the clergy put an end to scenes of murder, and that several of the most eminent members of the

Catherine de' Medici sent word to Pope Gregory XIII that the King, endangered by a great conspiracy, for the sake of his kingdom's tranquillity had to execute a large number of Huguenots, whereupon the Pope declared: "It seems that God is beginning to turn the eyes of His mercy upon us," and had a Te Deum sung to thank God for an event which he supposed had saved France; he also had a medal struck bearing the device, *"Ugonotorum strages."*

Two years later, King Charles IX, burning with fever and tormented by remorse, cried out on his deathbed: "How much blood! how much blood! . . . My God, pardon me!" [26]

The League

The religious strifes of which we have thus far spoken, appear rather as conflicts of great nobles, cabals of officials, court intrigues. A new element now introduced itself. The people, whose voice had been heard only in low and intermittent rumbling, now entered the conflict and in a vast movement, with many a fault, yet filled with glory, in the end forced their decision on the great and saved France from heresy.

Just as in the eleventh century rural communities united for the liberation of the communes and the salvation of the social order, as in the thirteenth confraternities of third orders were formed to regenerate the Christian spirit, so, in the middle of the sixteenth century, in presence of the ruins accumulated by Protestantism, leagues were formed here and

---

clergy denounced the St. Bartholomew massacre. At the States General, in 1614, Cardinal Du Perron denounced "those violent spirits who, being carried to one extreme, think the best means of justifying themselves is to pass to the other." Hardouin de Péréfixe execrated "that atrocious act which was never equalled and, please God, never will be." (*Histoire du roi Henri le Grand.*)

[26] On St. Bartholomew's Day, see: Philippson, *Die Römische Kurie und die Bartholomäusnacht;* Vacandard, *Les papes et la Saint-Barthélemy,* in *Etudes de critique et d'histoire religieuse,* pp. 219–292; Boutaric, *La Saint-Barthélemy d'après les archives du Vatican.*

there between "nobles, clergy, and citizens, under the king's good pleasure, to defend God's honor and that of His Roman Catholic Church." [27] Later, under the influence of the Cardinal of Lorraine who, it is said, conceived the idea at the Council of Trent, other leagues, with less regard for the "king's good pleasure," drawing their inspiration more especially from the confraternities and third orders, of which they were often merely an extension, agreed, like the League of Orleans in 1568, "to defend holy religion and to sustain one another to the last drop of their blood." [28] The St. Bartholomew episode which, it seemed, clearly marked the court's intention to be through with heresy, was the occasion for the dissolution of many of these leagues. But the attitude taken by the new King, Henry III, at the very beginning of his reign (1574), the repeated setbacks inflicted by the frivolous monarch upon defenders of the old faith, the extraordinary advantages extended to Protestants by the Edict of Beaulieu in 1576—full liberty of worship, except at Paris, and four new places of refuge [29]—awoke the Catholics.

The peace of May 6th, 1576, called the Peace of Monsieur, decided that the city of Péronne should be given over to the Prince de Condé as a place of refuge. The inhabitants of Péronne were indignant and refused to obey a master who, they said, wanted to make Huguenots of them. An act of union was signed "between prelates, gentlemen, and other good inhabitants of Picardy, resolved to use their goods and their lives, to the last drop of their blood, for the preservation of the city and the whole province in the king's obedience and the observance of the Catholic, Apostolic, and Roman Church . . . for the safeguarding of both clergy and the poor from all oppression and violence . . . for carrying out these purposes, to select a chief of the said confederation whom all will be bound to follow even to the point of death, and to enter into relation with similar confederations of the other provinces and even of neighboring nations" . . . as also "at the States General to offer the king certain articles to which he should swear, the while protesting to do nothing to the prejudice of what will be ordained by the said States," the entire aim being to restore to France "the franchises and liberties . . . of the time of King Clovis . . . and still better and more profitable, if such can be obtained." [30]

---

[27] Petitot, *Collection de mémoires relatifs à l'histoire de France,* XXII, p. 157.

[28] Brugère, *Tableau de l'histoire et de la littérature de l'Eglise,* p. 654; Vergniaud Romagnési, *Histoire d'Orleans,* II, p. 531.

[29] These four new places of refuge were: Saumur, Niort, Saint-Jean d'Angély, and Mézières.

"This would have been a Catholic revolution anticipating the French Revolution by two centuries. As yet it was only a league of nobles and needed to have the popular element join it." [31] This happened shortly after (1584), when the death of the King's brother, the last of the Valois, left as his sole heir, according to the Salic law,[32] Henry of Navarre, a Huguenot, the chief of the Huguenots. "Charles Hotman, a most virtuous citizen," says La Roche Blond, "entered into association with various ecclesiastics and citizens. A council of six members (later sixteen, corresponding to the sixteen quarters of Paris) directed the association, arranged secret meetings that were generally held at the Collège de Fortet, which thence was called 'the cradle of the League.' From various bodies of Parisian workmen came numerous new members. Then 'several good inhabitants of Paris, men of sound judgment,' were sent to different provinces to rally the local leagues 'so that there might be but one body moved by one and the same mind throughout France.' "[33]

---

[30] Palma Cayet, in Petitot collection, XXXVIII, p. 254; *Panthéon littéraire* (Buchon ed.), I, p. 8.

[31] Brugère, p. 661.

[32] Not according to the Salic law, such as it was drawn up by the Merovingian kings, but according to the Salic law which was transferred from the civil to the political order by the assembly of barons in 1316 and considered independently of any other fundamental law of the kingdom, such as the law of religion, which required that the king of France belong to the traditional religion of the French. Hence it is evident that the League, far from being a revolutionary undertaking, was really the expression of a traditional and constitutional sentiment. It rested on this principle that the French monarchy was limited by fundamental laws, the chief of which was that the king of France, a Catholic nation, could be none but a Catholic. The other fundamental laws, inscribed, not in written documents, but "in the hearts of all Frenchmen," were that the taxes had to be agreed to, that communal and provincial liberties were inviolable, that agreements made between individual citizens and the king had to be respected. Should any one violate one of these laws, even though it be a prince of royal blood or the king himself, the people had the right to rise up in order to have such law respected. Viollet, *Etablissements de saint Louis,* I, p. 180. Pope Sixtus V, in his Bull *"Ab immensa"* (September 9th, 1585)—the last act of official intervention by the popes in the matter of the temporal power of kings—rested on no other principles. *"Pronuntiamus,"* said the pope, *"ac declaramus Henricum quondam* [*Navarrae*] *regem et Henricum condensem fuisse et esse haereticos . . . ac proinde . . . eos ipso jure privatos et incapaces ac*

Henry of Navarre

This association realized that it needed a chief, at the same time not forgetting that "it was the people who formed the League," as a contemporary says, "and that in them rested its matter and substance, and that the Lorraine princes were but accessories." It turned to a Lorraine prince, Duke Henry of Guise, and asked him to become its director. He was of the same age as Henry III, tall and handsome, with a face made the more masculine by a large scar which won for him the surname of *Balafré* (the Scarred). He soon became the people's idol. "France," says Balzac, "became mad over this man, for to say the people were enamoured of him would fall short . . . and the Huguenots were mad over the League when they looked at the Duke of Guise."

---

inhabiles ad succedendum in quibuscumque principatibus . . . ac specialiter in regno Franciae." This Bull, omitted from the *Bullarium Romanum* in consequence of Henry IV's conversion, is to be found in the writings of that period, in the *Archives de l'histoire de France,* IX, p. 49, and in Segrétain, *Sixte V et Henry IV.*

[33] Lezeau, *De la religion catholique en France,* p. 41; *Dialogues entre le Maheustre et le Manant,* Paris, 1593, p. 439. Lezeau was a moderate defender of the League. His work has been published in the *Archives curieuses de l'histoire de France,* XIV, pp. 9–91. The author of the *Dialogues entre le Maheustre* (royalist gentleman) *et le Manant* (Leaguer) is probably Roland, one of the Sixteen.

The dramatic episodes of the war of the three Henries[34] are so well known from the secular history of France that we have no need to recount them in detail: the battles of Coutras and of Vimory, the Day of the Barricades, the States General of Blois and its important "cahiers," the assassination of Duke Henry of Guise, Henry of Navarre's march on Paris, the murder of Henry III, the proclamation of Cardinal Charles de Bourbon as king under the name of Charles X, Henry of Navarre's abjuration and his coronation at Chartres under the name of Henry IV, his triumphant entry into Paris amidst popular acclaim, and the evaporation of the League after Pope Clement VIII absolved the King from the censures he had incurred.

Two facts, however, are of such a nature as to call for particular mention by a church historian: the attitude of the papacy during the crisis and the French King's attitude at the time of his conversion.

At first glance the variety of means employed by Sixtus V, Gregory XIV, and Clement VIII, is disconcerting. But a closer examination of them shows a perfect unity of idea, simplicity and wisdom. Cardinal Sega says: "The pope's chief intention is to have the Catholic religion conserved in the kingdom of France and the latter reëstablished in its former splendor and dignity." To praise the zeal and efforts of the Leaguers for the defense of the Catholic religion, but without encouraging their acts of rebellion for fear of harming the unity of France; on the other hand, to urge the royalists to abandon their heretical leader, the while maintaining relations with them "so as not to break," as Clement VIII said, "any thread of importance to the welfare of Christendom"—such was the secret of the policy followed by the last popes of the sixteenth century, a policy, apparently varied and divergent, but in reality logical, prudent, and lofty.[35]

---

[34] Henry III, king of France, Henry of Navarre, leader of the Huguenots, and Henry of Guise, head of the Leaguers.

This policy was crowned with success by the conversion of Henry IV. The exaggerated claims of the Spaniards, who wanted to be recompensed for their support of the League by forcing it to acknowledge the Infanta of Spain, granddaughter of Henry II,[36] as queen of France, aroused the indignation of patriotic leaguers. "All Frenchmen will rather perish than permit the Spaniards to realize their claims," wrote Doctor Manclerc.[37] "The persistence of the Spaniards in trying to force the Infanta on us despite our laws," adds Desportes, "will occasion the party's ruin and the establishment of Navarre." [38] "The people," wrote the Duke of Feria, Spanish ambassador, "are impelled by a general desire toward a king of their own nationality." [39] Parliament solemnly "decided and decreed (June 18th, 1593) that repeated remonstrances be made to the Duke of Mayenne . . . to prevent this kingdom, which depends only on God in temporalities, from being seized by foreigners under pretext of religion." There seemed to be only one possible solution of the affair: the conversion of the King of Navarre. Henry had already thought of taking this step. With his ordinary frankness, he said to Sully on February 15th of that year: "Sully, I beg you to tell me freely what you would do if you were in my place." To this the Huguenot statesman replied: "To advise you to go to Mass is something you could not expect from me, since I am not a Catholic; yet I will say to you that you will never reign peacefully so long as you make external profession of a religion which is held in such aversion by both great and small." [40] This was the language of policy. At the same time, the Catholic prelates who had access to the King, chiefly his reader, Cardinal du Perron, made him listen to the language of conscience. "When his affairs were most difficult," wrote the Cardinal, "the King did me the honor to confer privately with me on the question of his conversion." [41]

---

[35] Such is the conclusion reached by L'Epinois in his important work, *La ligue et les papes,* based on documents in the national archives and especially the Secret Archives of the Vatican.

[36] L'Epinois, p. 591.

[37] Letter dated April 30th, 1593, quoted by L'Epinois, *l.c.*

[38] Letter dated July 22nd, 1593 (*ibid.*).

[39] Quoted by Forneron, *Philippe II,* III, p. 202.

Henry of Navarre was powerfully impressed by the report of a conference (April, 1593) in which du Perron, "that mind of stupendous knowledge," to quote d'Aubigné, put to rout fourteen Protestant ministers. The King wanted another discussion, to take place in his presence. It was held at Mantes, like the first, about the beginning of June.[42] At this disputation, two ministers, Rotan and Morlas, acknowledged the possibility of salvation in the Catholic Church, whereas du Perron denied it in Protestantism. It is reported that the King thereupon declared that he would take the surer side and would embrace the Catholic faith, "in which, as they all agreed, he could be saved, rather than that in which only one party assured it." [43] If this expression amounted to anything more than a bit of wit, Henry, it seems, was not long in recognizing the insufficiency of such an argument.[44] In fact, he summoned a meeting of prelates and doctors to be held July 20th at Saint-Denis "for the purpose of receiving instruction,"[45] and, in the course of his conversation with his catechists, he more than once showed deep emotion. "You have not quite satisfied me on this point," he said to them, speaking of the adoration of the Blessed Sacrament; "this day take my soul in your hands; I beg you to take care of it; once you have me within there where you are leading me, I will depart only at death; this I swear and protest to you."[46]

---

[40] *Mémoires,* pp. 107–110.

[41] Quoted by Féret, *Henri IV et l'Eglise,* p. 40.

[42] Féret, p. 51.

[43] Dupleix, *Histoire de Henri le Grand,* p. 119.

[44] "At bottom this famous bit of reasoning, so much admired by certain theologians, is a sophism. When Catholics say: 'It is impossible for you to be saved if you are a Protestant,' they mean 'if you are not in good faith'; and when Protestants grant that one can be saved as a Catholic, they mean 'supposing one is in good faith.'" (Brugère, p. 681.) If we are to accept Richelieu's statement, Henry IV confessed to the Queen (Maria de' Medici) that when he first made profession of being a Catholic, he embraced Catholic truth only in appearance in order to secure the crown, but that after the conference at Fontainebleau between Cardinal du Perron and Duplessis-Mornay (1600), he abhorred the Huguenots'

The following Sunday (July 25th, 1593) Henry abjured the Protestant religion in the presence of the Archbishop of Bourges, who granted him absolution from the censures he had incurred. This episcopal absolution was later on declared illegal by Pope Clement VIII and supplemented by a papal absolution.[47] From that time public opinion was with Henry IV, and the double aim of the Roman diplomacy was attained: the Catholic religion was "conserved in the kingdom of France and the latter reëstablished in its former splendor and dignity."

---

beliefs for reasons of conscience as much as he did their party for reasons of state." (*Mémoires de Richelieu;* Petitot collection, 2nd series, X, p. 157.) As for the famous expression that Henry IV is supposed to have uttered at the time of his conversion—"the crown is worth a Mass, Paris is worth a Mass"—it is altogether unlikely. Henri de Bearn was too clever to speak thus. Edouard Fournier thinks he has found the author in a satirical work of the time, first published in 1622 and reëdited in 1855 under the title of *Caquets de l'accouchée.* See Fournier, *L'esprit dans l'histoire,* p. 240.

[45] *Documents inédits sur l'histoire de France—Lettres missives de Henri IV,* III, pp. 815, 817.

[46] *Registre-Journal de Henri IV* in *Nouvelle collection de mémoires,* by Michaud and Poujoulat, p. 160.

[47] In the definitive absolution granted to Henry IV, Clement VIII declared the episcopal absolution "null, invalid, and of no effect" (*"nullam et invalidam ac nullius roboris et momenti"*). The Pope declared that he reserved to himself the supreme judgment of the conditions of Catholicity imposed on rulers. In this act, quite aside from the need of mollifying Spain, we can see the intention of preserving what could still be kept of the old international law of Europe.

The Edict of Nantes

Shortly afterwards, the King wished, by a decree, to sanction and regulate the religious pacification which his abjuration had determined. This was the object of the Edict of Nantes, promulgated April 15th, 1598.

The Edict of Nantes comprises 93 articles, with 36 supplementary articles, which were withheld from examination and registration by Parliament.[48] The first eighteen articles aimed at granting the broadest liberties to the Protestants. Full amnesty was granted for all past deeds during the religious wars. Not only could the public ministry thenceforth not bring any judicial action relative to these deeds, but they could not be made the occasion of any lawsuits between individuals (arts. 1 and 2). Catholic worship was to be reestablished wherever it had been suppressed; the "reformed" worship was to be freely carried on wherever it had been established and, in addition, in two designated places of each bailiwick (arts. 3, 9, and 11).[49] It was forbidden to attack Protestants from the pulpit (art. 17), to suborn their children (art. 18), to disinherit a relative because of his religion (art. 26). The reformers were to enjoy all civil and political rights and were to be admitted to all employments (art. 27).

These liberal concessions, so much in conformity with our present habits, seemed, in 1598, excessive to most Catholics, who knew that the Huguenots everywhere aspired, not to liberty, but to domination, that wherever they had possessed the power (*e. g.*, at Geneva and in Bearn) they had banished the Catholics.[50] To give liberty to such foes seemed a risky venture. But three privileges granted the Protestants especially aroused the apprehensions of Catholics. In the first place, the reformers had the right for eight years (and this period was later extended, as might have been foreseen) to hold places, called "refuges," the garrisons of which would be maintained by the King. Under this head, the Protestants kept more than two hundred cities, seventy of which could be defended, some, like La Rochelle, Montpellier, and Saumur, being strongly fortified. In the second place, the Protestants were authorized to hold assemblies periodically, a sort of states general, and to have delegates at the court, like ambassadors. Thirdly, a special commission of the Parliament of Paris, called the Chamber of the Edict, was charged with judging accusations against the reformers (arts. 30, 31, 32, etc.). Similar commissions were established in several provincial parliaments.

---

[48] Isambert, *Anciennes lois françaises,* vol. XV.

[49] A special difficulty presented itself for certain cities, notably for Paris. Treaties that had been entered into with the League had stipulated that the exercise of Calvinist public worship would be forbidden in Paris and a few other large cities. The decree of pacification professedly respected these treaties, but added that the members of the Reformed Church could freely sojourn in these cities and hold their services in the nearby outskirts. For Paris, Ablons was the designated place, near Villeneuve-Saint-Georges. It was there that Sully went to attend the Calvinist services, after making his offering of blessed bread at the Church of St. Louis. It used to be said that he belonged to two parishes.

The Pope objected to the Edict of Nantes, and the Gallican parliaments, which in former times had so loudly protested against the special jurisdiction of the Catholic Church, now denounced the military, political, and judicial privileges which made of the Calvinist Church a State within the State. They drew attention to the fact that the situation of the Protestants was more favorable than that of the Catholics and that the articles relative to fortified places, general assemblies, and judicial organization seriously altered the fundamental and traditional constitution of France. The King listened to these remonstrances, but confined himself to saying that he regarded the Edict, not as something absolutely good, but as the best possible under the circumstances. Doubtless he hoped that, during the eight years granted the Protestants for the enjoyment of their privileges, they would be converted. The conferences that he brought about between Catholic and Protestant theologians, the recall of the Jesuits despite the opposition of his entourage, the favor which he showed to those of his friends who abjured Calvinism—such as Gontaut-Biron, Palma-Cayet, and Sancy—seem to justify this hypothesis. Ravaillac's crime prevented the realization of these hopes.

---

[50] At the Saint-Bris conferences, in 1586, Catherine de' Medici said to the Vicomte de Turenne, the representative of Henry of Navarre: "The King wants only one religion in France." To this the Huguenot replied: "We also, Madame, but we intend that it shall be ours."

Scarcely had Henry IV drawn his last breath, when the assembly of Protestants submitted to the King a project "so drawn up," says Richelieu, "that, had the council been Huguenot, it could not have approved it." What the Protestants proposed was, in fact, a great federation, a sort of Protestant republic, established in France, divided into fifteen provinces and governed by a general council. The project was rejected. But the Huguenots, none the less, continued to profit by their situation in the State until they encountered the energetic policy of Richelieu.

CHAPTER X

Protestantism in the Countries of the North

The Netherlands

THE Low Countries were one of the most active centers of mysticism in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries. There Protestantism penetrated under its pseudo-mystic form.[1]

We saw above how a Swabian furrier, Melchior Hofmann, and a fanatical baker of Haarlem, John Matthys (or Matthiessen), became ardent propagators of Anabaptism.

The imagination of the Netherlands was inflamed by the theories of these men, who called themselves prophets and who preached a "reign of God" without church or dogma, community of goods, a return to "the primitive state," and obedience to nothing but "the inner light." [2] Charles V, on whom the Netherland provinces depended under the name of the "Circle of Burgundy," tried to stifle the movement by stern repression. But the Spanish Inquisition, which he introduced, bore too much the character of a political institution to bring about peace of conscience. Neither prison nor torture subdues deeply stirred souls. External peace was obtained; but the internal ferment continued, and was made use of by the leaders of the Protestant revolt in the Low Countries.

---

[1] We limit ourselves to a presentation of the major phases of this period. It seems that the time has not yet come for a final and detailed account of this movement. In 1907 the Peter Canisius Society decided to write a history of the Reformation in the Netherlands and several committees were appointed to gather the materials for it. Since then it has become evident that the ground was not sufficiently prepared by the publication of sources and by monographs on separate subjects. At one of its meetings (April 15th, 1909) the Canisius Society, after an address by Doctor Schoengen (state archivist at Zwolle), resolved to appeal to other scientific societies, especially the Nugensfonds and the Wetenschappelijke Vereeniging onder de Katholicken, in order to bring about the publication of a series of sources and monographs relating to the Reformation in the Netherlands.

[2] On Hofmann and Matthys, see Janssen, III, pp. 329, 334.

These leaders found other accomplices. In the "Circle of Burgundy," which had no more political than religious unity,[3] an impoverished nobility coveted the goods of the Church, a poorly organized clergy was lacking in priestly training,[4] a newly-rich bourgeoisie was losing the rugged family virtues in a life of luxury,[5] and the whole nation with difficulty tolerated the yoke of the Spaniards. Yet the people remained deeply attached to the Catholic religion: they would not see their faith shaken until the day when nobles and bourgeois should succeed in confusing, in their eyes, the cause of the religious Reformation with that of national independence. Their customs, moreover, retained certain remnants of barbarism. The right of private revenge was still guaranteed by Netherland law at the end of the fifteenth century.[6] A clever and unscrupulous leader, William of Nassau, prince of Orange, surnamed "the Silent,"[7] took advantage of all these revolutionary elements to stir up the country. As "stathouder" of the three provinces of Holland, Zealand, and Utrecht, he accorded hearty welcome, in the cities under his authority, to all political exiles, all proscribed heretics, and even criminals of every kind. These last, in the expectation of rich plunder, might be made into an armed force, terrible in its devotion to him. Philip II, though a wise and prudent ruler, was a man whose haughty bearing and too marked preference for the Spaniards displeased the Netherlanders; his coming in 1555 was the signal of rebellion. The unpopularity of Cardinal Granvella, the Spanish king's minister, and Philip's awkward evasions, made the situation worse. Agents from England and Huguenots from France stirred up the people. In 1564 Theodore de Bèze declared that the day of revolt had arrived.[8] Philip II ordered (October 17th, 1565) the strict execution of the former decrees of Charles V.[9] "Good," cried William the Silent, "this is the beginning of a fine tragedy." [10]

---

[3] In the whole Circle there were only four episcopal sees: Utrecht, Cambrai, Tournai, and Arras. The major part of the Circle was under German jurisdiction; one part, under that of French bishops. Münster, Osnabrück, Minden, and Rheims had domains in the Circle of Burgundy.

[4] A Dutch Catholic historian says: "Erasmus of Rotterdam is, in this matter, a severe but reliable witness. Though he observes neither dignity nor measure in his raillery, yet he is not a calumniator. When the Reformation entered a country which had supplied the author of *The Praise of Folly* with his principal satires, it found there a well-prepared soil." (Meuffels, *Les martyrs de Gorcum,* Paris, 1908, p. 30.)

[5] At the time of Charles V's abdication, Flanders was enjoying unparalleled prosperity. "At Antwerp," says Janssen, "they transacted more business in a month than in two years at Venice at the time of its greatest prosperity. Excessive well-being had corrupted their morals." (Janssen, IV, p. 265.)

[6] Petit-Dutaillis, *Documents nouveaux sur les mœurs populaires et le droit de vengeance dans les Pays-Bas au XV^e siècle.*

[7] Namèche, *Guillaume le Taciturne;* Tacheret, *L'évolution religieuse de Guillaume le Taciturne.* William the Silent was successively Lutheran, Catholic, and Calvinist. At bottom he was religiously indifferent.

Some weeks later, a meeting of about twenty nobles at a palace of the Prince of Orange drew up an alliance, the famous *Compromis des Nobles,* which soon received three hundred signatures. It is related that, when Margaret of Parma, regent of the Netherlands, became alarmed at this movement, Count de Barlaymont said to her: "Madame, are you afraid of these beggars?" The nobles proudly assumed this name "Gueux" (beggars) which had been cast at them in disdain. Soon afterwards, a great meeting of nobles decided that representatives of all the provinces should unite with the nobility in a solemn procession to demand religious liberty from Margaret and to agree to defend it by force of arms against the King of Spain. Everywhere the Gueux were acclaimed as saviors of the country. The *Compromis des Marchands* (Merchants' Alliance), the work of the upper bourgeoisie, promised the money needed for the contemplated resistance. In spite of the edicts, Calvinist ministers preached in the open air and at the city gates of Antwerp, Ghent, and Bruges. The lulled fanaticism of the old Anabaptists awoke and the collection of criminals, to whom William the Silent had granted ready hospitality, broke loose. "Popular excitement," says a Protestant historian, "soon burst into deeds of violence. In the course of August, churches and chapels were wrecked and images of the saints—emblems of 'Roman idolatry'—were pulled down and demolished. It was like a tempest passing with lightning speed over the seventeen provinces of the Netherlands, seizing unexpectedly on everyone, increasing the exaltation of the Calvinists, terrifying the Catholics and the government, deranging the stubborn but prudent calculations of the Prince of Orange. A countless number of masterpieces of the great painters and sculptors of the Middle Ages were thus destroyed in a few days by the blind fanaticism of the unrestrained multitude. The magnificent cathedral of Antwerp and many other churches, which were veritable art museums, lost all their treasures." [11]

---

[8] Janssen, IV, p. 269.

[9] The bishops of Ypres, Namur, Ghent, and Saint-Ouen, and several theologians met at Brussels and petitioned Philip II to moderate the edicts. The King would hear nothing of it. (See Lettenhove, *Les Huguenots et les Gueux,* I, p. 264.)

[10] This saying is reported by Vigilius, *Vita Vigilii,* p. 45.

Philip's anger was extreme. Cardinal Granvella and Pope Pius V [12] advised him to go to the Netherlands in person. He preferred to send the terrible Duke of Alva on a punitive expedition against the rebels.

The victor of Mühlberg, who had crushed the Protestant forces of Germany in 1547 and had ruled Italy with an iron hand, reached Holland, preceded by a reputation for unconquerable and merciless energy. Contemporaries describe him as "an old man, tall and thin, with a long, sparse beard." "He ruled the Netherlands," says Cardinal Hergenröther, "by arrests and torture, firmly resolved to maintain the Catholic religion in the provinces or to destroy them." [13] Sinister rumors circulated, mingled with calumnies. Two apocryphal writings distributed by the Gueux announced that the Spanish Inquisition and King Philip II had decreed the death of all Netherlanders. While this appeared unlikely to many, yet it none the less contributed to arouse the people. The *"Gueux de mer"* (Waterbeggars) lent their support to the *"Gueux de terre"* (Landbeggars) and traversed the sea as pirates. William the Silent treated with Coligny and also received subsidies from the Protestants of Germany. The people as a whole, until then strongly attached to the Catholic religion, began rallying to the Prince of Orange, whom they regarded as a defender of the fatherland against the foreigner. The raising of heavy taxes in the name of the King of Spain [14] served to detach the sincerest believers and most loyal subjects from the Spanish cause. "It was not," wrote Granvella, "an inclination to heresy and revolt that put arms into the hands of the Netherlanders; it was the harsh treatment meted out to them by the Spaniards."

---

[11] Paul Frederick, professor at the University of Ghent, in Lavisse and Rambaud, *Histoire générale,* V, p. 185. Says another Protestant author: "There is no doubt but the destruction of images was premeditated or tacitly permitted by these gentlemen of the League." (Bor, quoted by Janssen, IV, p. 273.) For information as to the popular agitation, knowingly stirred up by foreign emissaries, see Lettenhove, *op. cit.,* I, p. 355.

[12] The prudent advice given to Philip II by Cardinal Granvella may be seen in Gachard, *Correspondance de Philippe II,* I, pp. 201, 489, 518, 534, 560, 594, 599; II, p. 41. In Janssen, *Schiller als Historiker,* p. 56, may be found a justification of Granvella in the matter of the accusations brought against him by certain Protestants. On Pius V, see Gachard, I, p. 488; Lettenhove, I, p. 470.

The Calvinists took advantage of the popular uprising. Following the taking of Brielle by the "Waterbeggars," in 1572 nineteen priests and monks were put to death at Gorkum out of hatred for the Catholic faith. They met their end with admirable fortitude. Nicholas Pieck, guardian of the monastery of the Friars Minor, defended his faith to the last breath against the objections of the heretics and, to encourage his brethren to die nobly, was the first to ascend the scaffold. Godefried of Mervel, a humble brother sacristan, when he was being hoisted for hanging, cried out: "Lord, pardon them, for they know not what they do." Godefried van Duynsen thus addressed his executioners: "Make haste, for I see the heavens open." [15] Pius IX canonized (June 29th, 1867) the eighteen martyrs of Gorkum.

---

[13] Hergenröther, *Histoire de l'Eglise,* V, p. 492. For details, see Janssen, IV, p. 280; Gachard, II, pp. 4–6.

[14] These taxes were known by the name of hundredth, twentieth, and tenth. The Duke of Alva required each inhabitant to pay him, once for all, the hundredth part of the value of his property. Besides this, in all business transactions, he reserved for himself a twentieth levied on immovable property, a tenth on movable goods.

The pacific measures undertaken by Don Luis of Requesens (1572–1576), successor to the Duke of Alba, accomplished nothing. It was too late. The ambitious William of Orange, who had officially passed over to Calvinism, aspired to rule the Netherlands. On December 8th, 1576, a treaty of reconciliation, on the ground of national defense, united Catholic and Protestant representatives of all the provinces against the Spanish domination. This was known as the "Pacification of Ghent." It stipulated a general amnesty and the recognition of William of Orange as the King's lieutenant in the revolted provinces. Requesens' successor, Don John of Austria, the victor of Lepanto, was obliged to approve the Pacification of Ghent. On the question of national autonomy, the opposition seemed invincible.

A goodly number of devout Catholics with difficulty gave their support to an alliance that seemed to make them approve the Calvinist acts of violence. In 1579 a new governor, Alessandro Farnese, duke of Parma, after a series of negotiations that showed him to be a statesman of the highest order, succeeded in winning the provinces of the south to his cause. They concluded (January 6th, 1579) the "Union of Arras," in opposition to which the Calvinist provinces of the north formed (January 27th) the "Union of Utrecht." The Pacification of Ghent was broken. By the Union of Arras the future Belgium was preserved in the Catholic faith, whereas the Union of Utrecht laid the foundation of the Dutch Republic. In this latter region Calvinism became firmly established and the University of Leyden, founded in 1574, propagated the teachings of the Reformation. Contrary to his former promises, William (December 20th, 1581) forbade Catholic worship. Scenes of pillage and persecution were renewed, driving the faithful Catholics to desperate resistance.

---

[15] Leclercq, *Les martyrs,* VII, pp. 212–355, repeats the celebrated report of Willem Estius. See *Les martyrs de Gorkum* (in the series *Les saints*).

Maritime commerce, however, more and more flourishing, enriched the Gueux families. A commercial and financial aristocracy was formed, which impressed its own particular stamp upon Holland. The United Provinces were recognized in 1596 by Henry IV and Elizabeth, took rank among European powers, and soon became a powerful support to the Protestant policy in Europe.

The Scandinavian Countries

To the north of the Netherlands, the Scandinavian countries, united under the hegemony of the king of Denmark, had kept the faith preached there by St. Ansgar. During the troublous period of the fourteenth century, St. Brigid of Sweden and Queen Margaret of Denmark, two women of superior mind, exercised a profound and beneficent influence on those countries. St. Brigid, by her writings, her relations with popes and cardinals, and the founding of a new Order which was destined to combine the apostolate with the contemplative life, had strengthened the bonds that united her country to the center of the Church. Queen Margaret, in the midst of schism and at a time when wars were splitting the West, conceived and carried out the courageous project of uniting the three kingdoms of Denmark, Norway, and Sweden under a a single scepter. Her efforts ended in the famous Union of Calmar. Neither in the Scandinavian literature of the time, which was limited to translations of the Bible and of poems of chivalry, nor in the expressive and rudimentary religious art, was there any sign as yet of the influence of the Renaissance.

The three kingdoms were soon to be abruptly separated from Catholic unity by the political designs of two ambitious and covetous rulers.

Christian II assumed the government of the united kingdoms at the age of thirty-three (1513). He had but one aim: to make himself master of the Church as well as of the State. "He promulgated new legislation which reduced bishops to a status, as it were, of humble chaplains . . . He forbade the clergy to acquire landed property either by purchase or inheritance . . . Here and there we find such significant expressions as these: 'Bishops must preach the Gospel; the Gospels contain nothing about monastic vows; priests must not buy land unless they are willing to marry.' Such provisions indicate his Lutheran tendencies. But there is every reason to believe they were exclusively political." [16] Yet, about 1520, Christian invited Martin Reinhard, a follower of Melanchthon, to come so that he might make him a professor at his university. And to his uncle, Frederick of Saxony, he expressed a desire to see Luther.

Luther rejoiced at this news and wrote to Spalatin (March 5th, 1521): "Martin [Reinhard] informs us that the King [Christian] is getting after the papists." [17] Melanchthon confirmed the news, adding that Christian "had some bishops decapitated and some monks drowned." [18] The news was only too true. In Sweden and Norway, as in Denmark, Christian confiscated the property of bishops and monks, proceeded with pitiless severity against any who resisted, and openly favored the preaching of Lutheran doctrines.[19] "No good is accomplished by gentleness," he wrote to Erasmus; "the most effective means are those which weaken the body." As he displayed a merciless rigor and unexampled rapacity, not only toward the clergy, but also toward the nobility, the Swedish nobles rebelled. Gustavus Eriksson, son of one of his victims, raised an army, defeated the Danes, and had himself proclaimed king of Sweden (June 15th, 1523) under the name of Gustavus Vasa.[20] The work of Queen Margaret of Denmark was destroyed; that of St. Ansgar and St. Brigid was gravely endangered.

---

[16] Jules Martin, *Gustave Vasa et la Réforme en Suède,* p. 108.

[17] De Wette, I, p. 570.

[18] *Corpus reformatorum,* I, p. 364.

The new King of Sweden, wishing to change an elective monarchy into an hereditary and absolute kingdom, sought especially to crush the power of the nobility and clergy. "The subjection of the Church seemed above all indispensable to him for the accomplishment of his designs. Using now trickery and now violence, he attained his purpose, and nowhere was the Caesarian work of the Reformation established more speedily and in such an open, complete, and lasting manner." [21]

It was during a stay at Lübeck that Gustavus became acquainted with Lutheran doctrine. Olaf and Lars Petri (or Peterson), two brothers of Swedish origin, but trained at Wittenberg, were his able and devoted helpers: the former was appointed court preacher, the latter professor at the University of Upsala. Olaf preached Luther's doctrine on the marriage of priests and became married himself. The archbishop of Upsala and the bishop of Vesteras were put to death

---

[19] Jules Martin, *op. cit.*, p. 128.

[20] The name Vasa comes from the Swedish word for sheaf (*Vase*), which figured on the escutcheon of Gustavus Eriksson.

[21] Jules Martin, *op. cit.*, p. vi.

(February, 1527). As the new teaching found little favor with the Swedish people, Vasa played the hypocrite. "We wish no other religion," he said, "than that which our ancestors followed";[22] and he furnished letters of recommendation to Compostela pilgrims. But at the same time, by ruse or force, he became possessed of the property of the monasteries.[23] In 1529 the Senate published the celebrated act known as the Recess of Vasteras, the second article of which decreed as follows: "Considering that the revenue of the Crown is so small and that that of the Church and of bishops comes from the generosity of the laity and that the ambition of prelates often gives rise to troubles, the said revenues will revert to the Crown and the bishops' suites will be regulated by the king. The same will be true of the property of cathedrals and chapters. There will first be deducted merely what is needed for the support of the persons concerned. As to the monasteries, since they have long been administered by incapable hands, the king will provide a good manager for them."[24]

"By the year 1545," says the latest biographer of Gustavus Vasa, "the religious revolt of Sweden may be regarded as achieved. Save for an attempt of Calvinist propaganda under Eric XIV and an interesting but transient attempt at Catholic restoration under John III and his son Sigismund, the future king of Poland, the Lutheran Church of Sweden has kept, to our day, the essential traits that it received from the strong hand of Gustavus. And it is in the same sense that Charles IX and Gustavus Adolphus succeeded in organizing it."[25]

---

[22] *Ibid.*, p. 271.

[23] *Ibid.*, p. 316. On the value of Church property in Sweden at that period, see pp. 199–204.

[24] The text may be found in the Registers of Gustavus Vasa (1861 and the following years). Quoted by Jules Martin, p. 360.

[25] Martin, p. 489.

Other Countries

Protestantism was not destined to conquer any other great kingdom. Elsewhere Protestant heresy succeeded in penetrating only by slow infiltration. The Lutherans entered Poland early and were followed by Calvinists, Zwinglians, and Socinians. In that country, undermined by intestinal divisions, these various sects succeeded (1570) in forming a sort of confederation under the name of "Consensus Sendomiriensis." In Hungary, Lutheranism was propagated by students from Wittenberg, but was soon dominated by Calvinism, which expressed its dogmatic formulas in the *Confessio Hungarica.* Italy did not succeed in forming a Protestant Church or in formulating a confession of heretical faith. But from Italy came "Peter Martyr" Vermigli, who died at Zurich, Bernardino Ochino, who became a professor at Oxford, and Vergerio, who died while a professor at Tübingen. It was by the spread of Erasmus' works and under his patronage that ideas subversive of Catholic dogma entered into Spain. About 1560, Pope Paul IV became seriously alarmed. But the progress of error was arrested by the rigor of the Inquisition and by the activity of illustrious theologians, of whom we shall have to speak later on. For a moment the Lutherans turned hopeful eyes toward the Greek schismatics. In 1559 Melanchthon took the first step in that direction by sending the Augsburg Confession to the Patriarch of Constantinople. Somewhat later the Calvinists of Holland made a like attempt, but with no great success. Despite the common hostility against Rome which animated the two churches, there was too deep-rooted incompatibility between the mobile and shifting Protestant heresy and the fixed and immovable mass of Oriental schism.[26]

---

[26] Later on, in the seventeenth century, the patriarch Cyril Lucaris made profession of Calvinism. But this defection cost him his life.

With this last attempt ends the history of the Protestant movement among the Christian nations in the sixteenth century. If Luther seemed to personify it in himself by his genius and the celebrity of his conduct and if in the end the religious question did dominate it, yet it would not be exact to say that the Wittenberg friar began it, or that a religious idea was its sole starting-point. In fact, the Protestant revolt broke out, not only in Germany, but nearly everywhere in Europe, well before Luther's rebellion. In 1517, three years before the destruction of the papal Bulls by the friar of Wittenberg, the possessions of the Church had aroused the cupidity of King Christian of Denmark and his nobility. The violent attacks of the Netherland aristocracy on the monasteries began at the same period. At the very outset of the century, the Lollards were preaching anarchy in England. The armed bands which overran France in 1514, demanding the partition of property, knew nothing of Lutheran doctrines. When Luther proclaimed his defiance in 1520, the freebooting knights of Franz von Sickingen were already ravaging Germany. Nowhere, moreover, do we see the revolutionary spirit showing itself as an outburst of oppressed consciences or as a spontaneous movement or protest against the abuses of the Roman Court. The economic crisis that had just upset the world of wealth and toil, the social crisis which gradually dispossessed the old feudal nobility of its influence and property, the political crisis which gave birth to great centralized absolute monarchies—all these crises amply explain that universal uprising of starving peasants, covetous lords, and ambitious princes, pouncing upon the old régime, or rather upon the goods of the Church, which, in their eyes, were its most tangible expression. Luther's cry of revolt furnished a watchword to those unbridled passions.[27] The confederates of the Bundschuh sacked monasteries in the name of the "pure Gospel" quite as the Jacobins of 1793 sacked them in the name of fraternity. The religious point of view, which we must assume in writing this Church history, should not make us forget the important social side of the beginnings of the Reformation. Neither should it close our eyes to its political consequences. The consolidation of the absolute power of rulers,[28] the diminution of public liberties,[29] the increased bitterness of the class struggle—such is the situation which the sixteenth century at its close bequeathed to the seventeenth. "It is those countries which adopted the Reformation," says a Protestant historian, "whose political evolution is the least advanced." [30] Lord Molesworth, who was thoroughly acquainted with the Protestant North, remarked in 1692 that "in the Roman Catholic religion, with the head of the Church in Rome, is a principle of resistance against unlimited power, . . . but the whole northern population of Protestant countries have lost their freedom since they exchanged their religion for a better." [31] Donoso Cortés wrote: "Wherever the power of the

---

[27] "Döllinger, Janssen, and, more recently, Evers, have shown that the Protestant Reformation was the consequence of a political and national rather than of a re-

---

ligious movement." (Baudrillart, *The Catholic Church, the Renaissance, and Protestantism,* p. 82.) As the philosopher Balmes says, "if men have wandered so much in the definition and explanation of Protestantism, it is because they have not sufficiently observed that it is not only a fact, common to all ages of the history of the Church, but that its importance and its particular characteristics are owing to the epoch when it arose. . . . In place of Luther, Zwingli, and Calvin, let us suppose Arius, Nestorius, and Pelagius . . . it will all lead to the same result." (Balmes, *Protestantism and Catholicity Compared in Their Effects on the Civilization of Europe,* p. 29.)

[28] "Rulers ought to know," says Luther, "that there is nothing better for them to do than to subdue and dominate the common people." Commentary on the Canticle of Canticles. The confiscation of Church property, moreover, permitted Protestant rulers to dispense with the aid of their states and thereby bring about the destruction of public liberty. Besides, the disturbances of demagogy called for a monarchistic reaction.

[29] The régime established at Geneva by Calvin and in Scotland by Knox was that of a stern inquisition; and the uprisings of the peasants in Germany led to the restoration of serfdom by the decrees of 1633, 1648, and 1654.

[30] Georges Pariset, in his work, *L'état et les églises en Prusse sous Frédéric II,* quoted by Baudrillart, *op. cit.,* p. 312.

[31] Quoted by Döllinger, *The Church and the Churches,* p. 83.

Church was weakened, the civil power has seen its own might increase: the most certain guarantee of the liberty of the human race is the independence of the Church." [32]

---

[32] Donoso Cortés, quoted by Martin, *De l'avenir du protestantisme et du catholicisme,* p. 335. Cf. Cortés, *Lettres et discours,* p. 25.

PART III

The Catholic Reformation

CHAPTER I

The Catholic Reformation and the Popes of the Sixteenth Century

(1521–1600)

THE question of reform, which was a subject of much concern to Christians of the fifteenth century, was temporarily relegated to second place by the artistic and literary movement of the Renaissance. But after the death of Leo X (1521) it again began to stir the whole Church. In those scholarly and critical studies which so intensely absorbed the minds of intellectual men, in that sometimes insolent contempt for decadent Scholasticism, in that ill-defined mysticism which troubled many souls, in that spirit of independence which showed itself among the nations, in that exaggerated cultivation of ancient arts and letters, in the too clever political machinations of churchmen, and in the excessive magnificence of the Roman Court, everywhere good and evil were oddly commingled, and the need of a strong restoration of good order was felt. The revolutionary doctrines which an excommunicated monk spread under the name of Reformation did but increase the disorder. The wind of anarchy was blowing on institutions and on the souls of men.

Once again the Church found within herself the power of regeneration. However much the popes were absorbed by perplexing and difficult external affairs, they ceased not to labor at this great work. Bishops, too, assembled in the ecumenical Council of Trent, under the authority of the supreme pontiff, placed upon it the seal of their infallible magisterium. Devout persons among the laity, saintly religious, simple clerics, and humble women accomplished the work of regeneration, some by bringing the old monastic Orders back to their pristine austerity, others by founding new Orders under papal direction, all of which strove against heresy, carried the faith to distant lands, and caused sanctity to flourish in Europe. The sad century of Luther, Zwingli, Calvin, Henry VIII, and Elizabeth of England was likewise the glorious century of St. Pius V, St. Charles Borromeo, St. Ignatius Loyola, St. Francis Xavier, and St. Teresa.

Adrian VI

No one perceived the situation with greater clearness and courage than Adrian VI, the successor of Leo X. In an instruction drawn up for his nuncio Chieretaro, he wrote: "We know that evil has spread from head to foot, from pope to prelates: we all have deviated from the right way; to abuses in things spiritual are added abuses in the exercise of power; all has been vitiated." [1]

The traits of him who spoke thus were in singular contrast with those of his predecessor. A contemporary author relates that at the conclave after Leo X's death, when the Sacred College could not agree on any one of the cardinals present, Cardinal Julius de' Medici, the future Clement VII, proposed the choice of a Netherlander, namely, Cardinal Adrian of Utrecht, professor at Louvain University, a man little known at Rome, but who was reputed to be a saint. Cardinal Cajetan seconded this choice, which at once received a majority of votes.[2] When this humble priest took possession of the sumptuous apartments of Leo X and Julius II, he scarcely altered his rule of life, even retaining his old housekeeper and continuing his practice of rising very early in the morning. Everyone was edified by the regularity of his exercises of piety, the simplicity of his meals, and the strict conscientiousness with which he transacted daily business.[3] In appointments to ecclesiastical preferment, "never," says Ranke, "did a pope show himself more reserved; he proceeded with scrupulous conscientiousness." [4]

---

[1] Raynaldi, XI, p. 363.

[2] Sanuto, XXXIII.

But when Adrian VI undertook the most essential reforms, he encountered insurmountable obstacles. When he suppressed the excessive income attached to certain offices of the Roman Court, it was objected that he could not do so without wronging those who had licitly bought those lucrative posts at a just price. When he purposed changing the régime of marriage prohibitions and dispensations, he was told that by such reforms he would weaken the discipline of the Church. When he considered a revision of Church legislation in the matter of indulgences, it was pointed out to him that, whereas he would be doing something quite agreeable to Germany, he would risk the loss of Italy. At every attempt of reform he saw a thousand difficulties rise up. There could be no feeling of sympathy between the Italian people, habituated to the pomp of the Medici, and the austere Pontiff who, at sight of the ancient statues, could not help crying out: *"Proh! Idola barbarorum!"*

The Turkish peril, which became very threatening after the taking of Rhodes, and the French peril, which Italy considered equally menacing after the plots hatched in Sicily, perforce diverted the Pope from his schemes of reform. Moreover the brief duration of his pontificate—scarcely a year and a half—would not have allowed him to bring any major undertaking to a conclusion. On his tomb were engraved these words, written by himself shortly before his death: "How unfortunate that there are times when the best-intentioned man is obliged to yield." Even though yielding, Adrian VI at least left the example of a great effort.

---

[3] *"In sacrificio quotidianus et matutinus est. Ira non agitur, jocis non ducitur. Neque ob pontificatum visus est exultasse; quin constat graviter illum ad ejus famam nuntii ingemuisse."* (Sanuto, XXXIII, *Litterae directivae ad cardinalem de Flisco.*)

[4] Ranke, I, p. 73.

Clement VII

Julius de' Medici became pope and took the name of Clement VII. Could he and would he profit by that example? Being an Italian, a humanist of lofty culture, made familiar with world affairs through the important posts he had held under Leo X and Adrian VI, the new Pope, it seemed, would meet none of the obstacles that paralyzed his predecessor's efforts. The instructions given by him to Campeggio, his nuncio at the diets of Nuremberg and Augsburg,[5] show how sincere and earnest were the reforming intentions of this intelligent, pious, and moderate Pope.[6] "Seldom have high expectations been so cruelly disappointed as they were in Clement VII . . . His pontificate was one of the most disastrous known to history. The chief cause of this is to be found in the inconceivable irresolution and pusillanimity of the Pontiff, who lost courage at once and let the helm fall from his grasp. It needed the royal spirit, the bold determination, the mighty strength of a Julius II." [7] The failure of his nuncio, Campeggio, at the Diet of Nuremberg, whither he had been sent in 1524 to urge the execution of the Edict of Worms and to devise means of reforming the clergy, seems to have discouraged the Pope from any attempt in the matter of discipline and morals.

To save at least the temporal authority of the Holy See appears to have been the aim of all his efforts. Although favorably inclined toward the Spaniards, whose fellow-countryman he was through family origin, and being a personal friend of the Emperor, he was unable to stop in time the successive invasions of imperial forces into the peninsula. In the summer of 1326, Italy rose up for its deliverance. The Pope was obliged to place himself at its head against the invaders. But no tactics were more fatal for him. The next year the Connétable de Bourbon with imperial troops and the Lutheran bands of Frundsberg took Rome and sacked it. After the grief of combating his own compatriots, the unfortunate Pontiff had the humiliation of seeing the Holy City sacked by his former friends in a campaign for which he might justly hold himself responsible.[8] Nor was he happier in his negotiations with Francis I, to whom, in 1533, he promised the hand of his niece, Catherine de' Medici, for the future Henry II. The King of France promptly allied himself with the Landgrave of Hesse, that redoubtable protector of Protestantism in Germany.[9]

---

[5] Janssen, I, p. 347; III, p. 183; Ranke, I, p. 85.

[6] Pastor, VII, p. 8.

[7] *Ibid.;* cf. Fraikin, *Nonciatures de Clement VII,* I, pp. 52, 79.

Meanwhile Charles V, master of all Italy, insistently demanded the calling of a council. But, it was his idea that the council should be convoked in the name of the Emperor and should deliberate under his influence. In an interview between Clement VII and the Emperor at Bologna, in 1534, the Pope, having let Charles V take the initiative in a matter that rightly belonged to the former, saw himself in the sad necessity of opposing the meeting of such an assembly. What would he have gained in seeing heresy condemned if he thereby made himself dependent upon imperial authority?[10]

---

[8] Guicciardini, XX, p. 2. Charles V, displeased at the alliance between Clement VII and Francis I, had sworn to take vengeance on "this villainous Pope." (Dispatch of the Venetian ambassador Contarini, quoted by Fraikin, I, p. 35.) Details of this campaign will be found in the diplomatic dispatches published by Fraikin, I, pp. 360–394.

[9] Ranke, I, p. 90.

[10] On the Bologna interview, see Pallavicini, *Histoire du concile de Trente*, bk. 3, ch. 12. Clement VII wrote to the Emperor: "*Nessun remedio e piu pericoloso, per*

Not only did all the arms, spiritual and temporal, against heresy seem to break in the hands of the ill-fated Clement VII, but the next year he saw the great kingdom of England separate itself from the Church. A third of Europe was now withdrawn from obedience to the pope. To the east, Hungary, that country which had been Europe's bulwark against Islam, was overcome in 1529 by the Turks in the famous battle of Mohacs, and, torn by internal strife, ceased to exist as a nation.

The very excess of so many evils produced an awakening of national and Christian sentiment. While European rulers were concerting for resistance to a possible Turkish invasion, religious life and apostolic zeal were being renewed in the Church through the foundation of the Theatines, Capuchins, Somaschi, and Barnabites, and when the most unfortunate of the popes [11] went down to his grave, the most militant of religious Orders, the Society of Jesus, had just come into being.

Paul III

A pope, whose worldly youth seemed not to have predestined him for the part of a reformer, took advantage of this movement. Alessandro Farnese had already shone in the school of Pomponio Leto and the society of Lorenzo de' Medici among elegant humanists. From his studies and lofty associations he retained an air of nobility and dignified bearing and distinguished manners, which won everybody to him. In 1534, at the age of sixty-six, he succeeded Clement VII

partorir maggiori mali [*del Concilio*] *quando non concorrono le debite circonstanze.*" (*Delle lettere di principi,* II, p. 197.) "The Pope," says Pallavincini, "was not inclined favorably toward the council, for he judged this remedy but little suited to the nature of the general evil and also injurious to his interests at the time." (*Histoire du concile de Trente,* bk. 2, ch. 10, nos. 1 sqq.)

[11] Pastor, VII, p. 8.

and took the name of Paul III. He took his duties seriously. His first anxiety was to spare Europe and the Church the evils of a Mussulman invasion. With consummate circumspection and address, in an interview at Nice, he sought to reconcile Charles V and Francis I, arranged the marriage of one of his nephews to a natural daughter of the Emperor, and of one of his nieces to the Duke of Vendome, a prince of French blood.

While the imperial troops were crushing the forces levied by the Smalkaldic League, Paul III devoted all his efforts to the work of reform. By the appointment of a commission on studies—including such illustrious cardinals as Sadoleto, Pole, Contarini, and Caraffa [12]—by the approbation of the Society of Jesus (1540), by the reorganization of the tribunal of the Inquisition (1542),[13] by the institution of a strict censorship of books and the publication of an Index (1543),[14] and lastly by the opening of the Council of Trent (1545), Paul III launched the question of the Catholic Reformation on the way to positive realization. He published numerous Bulls to cure various abuses,[15] and, attacking those which he saw nearest and which were not the least difficult to abolish, he exhorted the cardinals "to bring about an exemplary reform in themselves and in the whole Roman Court." [16] He strove to introduce the most deserving men into the Sacred

---

[12] On this *Consilium delectorum cardinalium ac aliorum praelatorum de emendenda Ecclesia,* see Mansi, Suppl. V, p. 537, and Le Plat, *Monumenta,* II, p. 596.

[13] The Bull *"Licet ab initio"* (July 21st, 1542). *Bullarium* (Coqueline's ed.), IV, p. 211. Cf. Ranke, I, pp. 157–163.

[14] The universities of Paris and Louvain had already published catalogues of condemned books, *Indices librorum prohibitorum.* (D'Argentré, *Collectio judiciorum de novis erroribus,* I, append. p. 37, and II, pp. 134–136.) Paul IV's Index, published in 1557, is the first to have the present form. New arrangements of the contents and important revisions were added by Benedict XIV in 1757 and Gregory XVI in 1841.

[15] On his reforms in the Curia, see Raynaldi, 1536, no. 37, arts. 54 sqq.; 1539, no. 22; 1540, no. 65.

[16] Pallavicini, bk. 3, ch. 17, no. 3.

College. The granting of unwise favors to members of his family [17] was the great fault of his life, a fault that cost him bitter tears. He died, sadly repeating the Psalmist's words: *"Si mei non fuerint dominati."*

Julius III

Undoubtedly the members of the Sacred College, in placing the tiara on the head of Cardinal del Monte, who had given proofs of wisdom and energy, did so in the hope of imparting a new impulse to the reform movement. But the responsibilities of high office, stimulating and ripening for some, are disconcerting and dejecting to others. This latter was the case of the new Pope, who, in memory of Julius II, whose camerlengo he was, took the name of Julius III.

The ambitious and restless Farnese family, loaded with riches and dignities by Paul III, disturbed Italy, negotiated alliances with the King of France, and provoked reprisals by the Emperor. "We never thought," wrote the Pope, "that God would so afflict us." [18] On the other hand, the attitude taken in the council by certain bishops, especially by the German deputies, disquieted him.[19] By suspending the assembly (1552) he seemed to free himself from a painful care. Thenceforth the down-hearted Pontiff appeared to become more and more unconcerned with public duties. He withdrew to a villa near Porta del Popolo and there seemed to forget the rest of the world except, alas, his relatives and some of their friends, on whom he showered dignities and privileges beyond measure.

---

[17] Among these we must number a son and a daughter, publicly acknowledged by him as such. Were they born of a legitimate union? There is no authentic document revealing that Alessandro Farnese had been married before receiving Holy Orders. The fact that contemporary chroniclers speak of the Pope's children without showing any feeling of horror over the irregularity of their birth, is not a peremptory argument in that unfortunate sixteenth century. Paul III's son, Pier Luigi, after a life of ambition and intrigue, met a wretched end, being assassinated at Piacenza in 1547.

[18] From a letter (April 13th, 1552) to C. Crescentio.

[19] A letter, dated January 16th, 1552.

Marcellus II

It was to ward off every appearance of such abuses that the virtuous and austere Marcello Cervini, elected pope April 11th, 1555, under the name of Marcellus II, began by removing the members of his family to a distance and by economically regulating the expenses of his court. "That reform in the Church, of which others only talked, he exemplified in his own person."[20] After a pontificate of only twenty-one days, death took him just as he was preparing a detailed programme for the restoration of the Church. To him the Romans applied the verse written about another Marcellus:

> *"Ostendent terris hunc tantum fata, neque ultra*
> *Esse sinent."*

Paul IV

He was succeeded by a man seventy-nine years old, but one who in his whole exterior—in his poise of body, his quick step, and the bright gleam of his eye—manifested the ardor of youth. It was Giovanni Pietro Caraffa, who, along with St. Cajetan, had founded the Order of Theatines and who, in conjunction with Cardinal Alvarez of Toledo, had persuaded Paul III to reorganize the Inquisition. He took the name of Paul IV. This severe and incorruptible old man, who knew that he had not made the slightest move to be elected pope, always affected to consider himself as directly chosen, not by the Sacred College, but by God. In a Bull issued on the occasion of his accession, he took a solemn oath "to be scrupulously painstaking in carrying out the universal reformation of the Church and the Roman Court." On the very day of his coronation he sent two monks of Monte Cassino to Spain for the purpose of restoring monastic life there. He established a congregation for this universal reform and sent to the different universities the list of subjects on which this commission was to deliberate. The people of Rome, whom he exempted from various taxes, erected a statue to him.

---

[20] Ranke, I, p. 212.

The generous but somewhat excessive ardor of the vigorous reformer proved a snare for him. No one tolerated the yoke of Spanish domination with greater indignation than he, who had known the free Italy of the fifteenth century. Carlo Caraffa, one of his nephews, who had personal grievances against Philip II, imparted his resentful animus to the Pope. The patriotic Pontiff swore to restore independence to his country and declared war on Philip. Deceived by the hypocritical exterior of his nephew Carlo—a soldier abandoned to every vice—he raised him to the cardinalate. Another nephew he made duke of Palliano; a third, marquis of Montebello. Once again nepotism, that plague of the Church ever since Sixtus IV, seemed to spoil the whole reform work of a zealous pontiff.

The defeat of the papal troops and the invasion of the States of the Church by the Duke of Alva (September, 1556) obliged Paul IV to put an end to his warlike undertakings. At last he opened his eyes to the shameful conduct of his nephews. One day, as he was speaking to his cardinals on the subject of reformation, Cardinal Pacheco interrupted him, saying: "Holy Father, you must needs begin this reform with yourself." These words struck his upright and sincere heart. He convoked the Sacred College (January 27th, 1559), called God to witness that he knew nothing of his nephews' infamous behavior while he was showering dignities on them, and at once deprived them of all their offices and exiled their families. Carlo Caraffa was forcibly expelled by the Swiss guard. The young marchioness of Montebello, finding her palace closed, was obliged to wander without asylum until a poor tavern gave her hospitality.[21]

The Pope then turned his attention to the reform of the Church with the same inexorable rigor.[22] In his honor a medal was struck, showing Christ driving the buyers and sellers out of the Temple. Paul IV boasted that he did not let a single day pass without striking at some abuse; it must be acknowledged that a large number of his reform measures were so well conceived that they passed into the decrees of the Council of Trent. By preference he turned his attention to the Inquisition, which he had labored to reform and strengthen.[23] He never failed to be present at the regular Thursday meeting of the Holy Office, extended the jurisdiction of that body to additional crimes, and bestowed on it the right of using torture to discover accomplices. He saw to it especially that the inquisitors should never be hindered by consideration of person and did not hesitate to cite even barons and cardinals before this high ecclesiastical court.

On August 18th, 1559, although laid low by disease, he had the courage to assemble the Sacred College about his death-bed and breathed his last while recommending to it the cause of the Holy See and of the Inquisition. The people of Rome, mindful of his nephews' vices and attributing to him the invasion of the States of the Church by the Spanish forces, upon learning of his death, demolished his statue and set fire to the palace of the Holy Office.[24]

---

[21] For more details of this whole affair, see Ancel, *La disgrâce et le procès des Caraffa,* in the *Revue Bénédictine,* April, 1907.

[22] See Ancel, *L'activité réformatrice de Paul IV,* in the *Revue des Questions Historiques,* July 1st, 1909.

[23] To avoid going astray in this complex question of the Inquisition, it is necessary to distinguish between: "1. the episcopal Inquisition and the beginnings of the papal Inquisition in the thirteenth century; 2. in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries, the Inquisition well established, organized with all its regulations, exercising a powerful but inconstant pressure on the whole Christian world, often opposed by political events; 3. in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, the Roman Inquisition, organized against the precursors of Luther and the Reformation and making itself felt especially by the action of the Holy Office, an action that was moral rather than material; 4. the Spanish and Portuguese Inquisition, reorganized by Catholic monarchs at the close of the fifteenth century, an institution at once ecclesiastical and civil, with a power unknown to the other inquisitions." (Jean Guiraud in the *Revue pratique d' Apologétique,* November 1st, 1909.)

Pius IV

One of Pius IV's first cares was to resume the work of reform by less violent methods. He was the son of Bernardino Medici, a modest farmer on public land. Being of a mild, peaceful disposition and an engaging manner, he offered a striking contrast to his predecessor. The work of disciplinary restoration, which the strong hand of Paul IV had so energetically started, he would doubtless not have dared to undertake. But he abolished none of his predecessor's ordinances and contented himself with putting a measure of moderation and mildness into their application. He did not like the Inquisition and openly declared his aversion to it, but he added that, since learned theologians approved this supreme means of combating heresy, he had nothing to alter in what had been established.

---

[24] Gebhart (Lavisse and Rambaud, IV, p. 36) speaks of Paul IV as "this ascetic, a heavy eater and a drinker of mangiaguerra, the terrible black wine of Vesuvius." Ranke (I, p. 217) says: "He would sit for long hours over the black, thick, fiery wine of Naples, his usual drink (it was of a sort called mangiaguerra)." Both these statements depend on a passage of Navagero, a Venetian ambassador, whose meaning is quite different. The ambassador relates merely that the Pope was obliged to prolong his meals because of a disease. As for "the terrible black wine of Vesuvius," mentioned by Gebhart, it was a wine produced from the soil of Naples, and Paul IV used it because he was a Neapolitan. These are Navagero's words: "He used to eat in public like other popes, till his last indisposition, which was mortal. When he lost his appetite, he often spent three hours at table. After taking his repast, he always drank wine of Malvoisie, with which, however, as his intimates say, he merely washed his teeth. At dinner he drank of the wine called mangiaguerra." (Quoted by A. de Saint-Chéron in Ranke, I, p. 217.)

Once only was he seen to resort to stern measures; and it may well be that these measures must be attributed to the pressure of public opinion, rather than to his own initiative. The rigorous attitude adopted by Paul IV against the members of his family had not appeased the hatred which the people nourished against the Caraffas. A sad domestic tragedy drew attention to them. The Duke of Palliano through jealousy killed his wife. His trial brought to light other accusations, falsehoods, evil conduct of all sorts, murder, and brigandage. Presently it became a trial of the whole family of the late Pope. One might say that the resentment accumulating in the popular soul for three-quarters of a century against the "wicked nephews" of various popes—the Riarii, the Rovere, the Borgias, the Medici, and the Farnese—now broke loose against the Caraffas. The documents of the trial which have come down to us show that the charges frequently passed beyond the bounds of justice and truth. St. Pius V later on had the trial reviewed and punished the recorder.[25] The Marquis of Montebello escaped punishment by flight, but the Duke of Palliano, Cardinal Carlo Caraffa, and two of their near relatives were put to death. This terrible example put an end to an abuse, the origin of which is comprehensible,[26] but the results of which had been most harmful to the Church and society.

Pius IV himself, it is true, did not seem free from nepotism. By heaping dignities on the head of his nephew, Charles Borromeo, by summoning him to his side and associating him in his government, he intended to make him one of the great personages of the Roman Court. The grace of God made him a saint. The fine qualities of the nephew covered up whatever may have been faulty or abnormal in his precocious elevation. To St. Charles Borromeo no less than to Paul IV should be credited the formation of the commission of eight doctors who later became the "Consulta," the efforts to enforce canonical residence on the part of the bishops, the skillful foiling of the maneuvers of the Emperor and the French Court, who were trying to obtain authorization for the marriage of priests and communion under both species for the laity.[27] It was also St. Charles who thwarted the efforts of those princes, favorable to the Protestants, who were calling for a new council. By his decisive intervention, the labors of the interrupted council were resumed on Easter, 1561.[28] In short, the promptness, zeal, prudence, and regularity which were remarked in the conduct of affairs, both temporal and spiritual, were due to the energetic Cardinal's initiative.

---

[25] Pallavicini, bk. 14, ch. 4.

[26] See above, p. 155.

Among the last acts of this great pontificate were the Bull *"Benedictus Deus"* (January 26th, 1564), approving all the decisions of the Council of Trent, the establishment of a commission to interpret them and to execute its decrees, the promulgation of the rules of the Index, the imposition of a profession of faith on all the clergy and all professors or graduates of any faculty, and lastly the impulse given to the founding of seminaries.[29]

St. Pius V

Holiness entered the councils of the head of the Church with Cardinal Charles Borromeo; with Michele Ghisleri, who took the name of Pius V, it ascended the papal throne. He was born of humble parents at Bosco, near Alessandria, became a Dominican at the age of fourteen, and head of the Inquisition under Paul IV. Everywhere he gave the impression of austere virtue, boundless charity, and angelic piety. St. Charles Borromeo declared that he had greatly contributed to his election. "Having known the Cardinal of Alessandria for a considerable time," he says, "and conceived a high esteem for him on account of his singular holiness and zeal, I judged that no more fitting pontiff than he could be found to rule the Christian commonwealth wisely and well. I therefore took up his cause with all my might." [30]

---

[27] Raynaldi, 1560, nos. 55, 56.

[28] By way of prudence, the Pope did not expressly say that the new gathering would be a continuation of the previous council, but he refused to summon, in explicit terms, a new council.

[29] Pallavicini, bk. 24, ch. 9.

The burden of governing the Church, far from turning the new Pope from the practice of virtue, was an additional stimulus to his piety. On seeing the holy Pontiff pass in procession, with his sharply defined features and deep-set eyes revealing the austerity of his virtues, while his clear look and gentle smile betokened the goodness of his heart, the people could not repress a feeling of admiration and liking for their new pope. Pius V took as his motto that no one can rule others save by ruling himself. He began his reform with the highest dignitaries of the clergy. He granted few dispensations, privileges, or favors. An auditor general was appointed by him to make a report on all archbishops and bishops not residing in their dioceses.[31] Pastors were ordered, under the severest penalty, not to leave their parish churches.[32] The relations between monks and the diocesan bishops were strictly regulated.[33] Strict cloister was imposed on nuns. As lay interference had been one of the most frequent causes of the decline of churches and monasteries, the watchful Pontiff forbade all infeudation of church property under whatsoever pretext, and decreed excommunication against any and all who should aid such action, even though only by advice.[34]

---

[30] A letter (February 26th, 1566) to the Cardinal of Portugal, quoted by Giussano, *Life of St. Charles Borromeo,* I, p. 72.

[31] *Bullarium,* IV, p. 303.

[32] *Ibid.,* p. 24.

[33] *Ibid.,* p. 177.

[34] Bull *"Admonet Nos,"* March 29th, 1567.

What the Pope's holiness accomplished in the government of the universal Church, the holiness of several bishops and religious did in dioceses and monasteries and thence in the lay world. St. Charles Borromeo reinvigorated the clergy by the foundation of seminaries, by holding numerous synods, and especially by his exemplary life, while the young Society of Jesus and the zealous Congregation of the Oratory spread a taste for solid piety in all classes of the lay world.

The saintly Pontiff, mindful of the importance of liturgical prayer and catechetical instruction in the life of the Church, published a new Breviary and Missal, drawn up "after the most ancient and authentic manuscripts that could be found in the Vatican Library and that could be acquired elsewhere." [35] By means of the Roman Catechism he saw to it that the chief dogmatic propositions of the Council of Trent were placed within reach of all.

After this work of internal restoration, which may be considered the principal object of his labors, Pius V turned his attention to the general situation of the Church, threatened from without by the Turks and torn within by heresy. We know how, by countless efforts, he gathered the armed forces of Christian nations under the command of Don John of Austria and had the happiness to see a great victory won over the Ottoman fleet at Lepanto (October 7th, 1571), thus ending the maritime preponderance of the Turks. On this occasion he instituted the feast of Our Lady of Victory which, under Gregory XIII, became the feast of the Rosary.

Three great Catholic nations—France, Italy, and Spain—had thus far resisted heresy. To King Charles IX of France, Pius V sent troops to be used against the Huguenots. For the preservation of Italy and Spain he saw no other salvation but the wise and firm organization of the Inquisition. While he encouraged rulers, notably Philip II, to combat heresy, we must at the same time recognize that he opposed the King of Spain when the latter sought to make of the Holy Office a tool of the government or when he exercised inordinate zeal in the pursuit of heretics and infidels. The Pope rescued Archbishop Carranza of Toledo from the hands of the royal Inquisition,[36] aided in the reconciliation of relapsed Judaizers, assured holy communion to those condemned to death,[37] and reminded King Philip II of the stipulations made by different popes for the protection and peaceful evangelization of the American Indians.[38]

---

[35] *"Collatis omnibus cum vetustissimis nostrae vaticanae bibliothecae aliisque undique conquisitis emendatis atque incorruptis codicibus."* (Bull *"Quoniam vobis,"* July 9th, 1568.)

To avoid vexatious meddling by Catholic kings in the affairs of the Church, "he ordered the publication, not only at Rome, but throughout the Church, on Holy Thursday, of the ancient Bull *'In caena Domini,'* [39] which was a summary of the old public law of that Christian commonwealth which was disappearing." [40]

But the two great nations that heresy wrenched from the Church did not cease to be the object of the Pontiff's anxious solicitude. Through the negotiations of Commendone, his able ambassador to the court of Emperor Maximilian II, and especially by the encouragement given to missions and Catholic schools, Pius V prepared the ground for Germany's Catholic reaction in the next century. The moral assistance which he gave to Mary Stuart and his efforts to arouse an effective Catholic resistance to the religious despotism of Elizabeth, were unhappily not seconded.[41] At the time of his death Pius V was contemplating an expedition to England, with himself at its head. One of his last utterances was this: "If needful, God will raise up from the very stones the man we need."

---

[36] See Balmes, *op. cit.*, ch. 37.

[37] See the Brief, published by Falloux, *Vie de saint Pie V*, ch. 14.

[38] See the Pope's letters in Falloux, ch. 15.

[39] Published by Urban V in 1363.

[40] Brugère, p. 823.

[41] On this intervention see Jules Martin's scholarly article, *"Grégoire XIII et l'Irlande,"* in the *Revue d'histoire diplomatique*, 1909, no. 2.

Gregory XIII

St. Pius V died May 1st, 1572. The providential man for whom he had hoped was not found. But the impulse given to the Catholic reformation in the whole Church was such that a mediocre pontiff, coming after that great pope, would feel himself drawn into the movement. Ugo Buoncompagni of Bologna, who took the name Gregory XIII, was by no means mediocre. His youth had been passed in the midst of worldly pleasures and affairs,[42] but after his ordination to the priesthood his moral conduct was irreproachable and his pontificate truly great. By the encouragement which he gave to the development of works of education and instruction, he assured the continuation and extension of the reform movement set on foot by St. Pius V. Newly established religious Orders supplied him with numerous well trained workers, and he made good use of them. At Rome he founded colleges for the English, Germans,[43] Greeks, and Maronites. In various countries he created or reëstablished twenty-three other colleges, including those of Vienna, Prague, Graz, Olmütz, and Vilna; and his concern for education reached even to Japan. He wished to make of the Collegium Romanum, founded by St. Ignatius (1550), a "College of all nations." On the day of its opening there were delivered twenty-five addresses in different languages. In 1584 no less than 2700 students were enrolled in this celebrated college, from the alumni of which have come almost five hundred archbishops or bishops, more than fifty abbots or generals of religious Orders, and eleven martyrs.

---

[42] The birth of his son Giacomo is under the same cloud as that of Paul III's children.

[43] To the Collegium Germanicum he joined, in 1580, the Hungarian College, founded by him three years before.

In each of these foundations may be seen the Pope's bigness of mind. At the Greek College were to be received boys between the ages of thirteen and sixteen, not only from countries under Christian domination, but also from those countries which were under a schismatic or infidel government. And they were to have Greek professors. The students wore the kaftan and Venetian cap; they were to be educated in a thoroughly Greek way so as constantly to bear in mind that they were to return to their own country. They were to be left the use of their own rite, as also of their native tongue.[44] Ever concerned with the extension of Catholic influence in the East, Gregory XIII founded a printing establishment for fifty Oriental languages and sent in search of manuscripts to Egypt, Ethiopia, and various countries of the East. In 1582 he published the official edition of the *Corpus Juris Canonici,* the revision of which had been ordered by Pius V in 1566.

The best known of Gregory's reforms is that of the calendar—a reform that had long been desired. By the time of Gregory XIII the Julian calendar was ten days behind astronomical time. The Council of Trent, by fixing certain important feasts according to their relation with the seasons, made a revision of the calendar indispensable. Luigi Lilio, a Calabrian astronomer, pointed out a simple, easy method to correct the inaccuracy of the former calendar. The pope submitted the proposal to a commission of learned men and, after sending it to the Catholic courts, solemnly published the reform by Bull (February 13th, 1582).

Shortly before his death, the tireless reformer published a new edition of the Roman Martyrology, carefully corrected by the learned Cardinal Baronius.

The enterprises of this pontificate were not accomplished without enormous expense. Baronius calculated that the help which Gregory gave to poor youth for their education cost two million francs. Lorenzo Priuli estimated the amount expended yearly by the Pope for works of piety at 200,000 scudi. The twenty-two Jesuit colleges founded by him considerably increased his budget. On the other hand, the strict reformer had firmly resolved never, for the relief of his finances, to have recourse to new taxes, nor to spiritual concessions, nor to the sale of church property. What other means was there? Gregory, guided by a too absolute idea of social justice, considered that a large part of the castles and property of nobles depending on the Holy See should devolve to the papal patrimony, either through the extinction of the line that had been invested therewith, or by failure on the part of beneficiaries to carry out the obligations imposed. Nothing seemed more logical in theory, but nothing was harder or more dangerous in practice than to appoint revision commissions and to enforce the restitution of property unrightfully held.

---

[44] *Dispaccio a Antonio Tepolo,* March 16th, 1577.

On all sides arose claims and suits. Many nobles thus threatened took a hostile stand to defend their possessions. In the ensuing disorder, old factions revived. In the churches no less than on the streets and public squares there appeared the Guelf, with threatening air and ready dagger, wearing a feather on the right side of his hat, and the Ghibelline, equally threatening, with a feather on the left side. Nobles organized themselves into robber bands under the leadership of great lords, such as the Piccolomini, Malatesta, and Orsini. "Even though I am a lost man," declared one of them in the Pope's presence, "I will at least have the satisfaction of defending myself." Commonplace bandits assumed a knightly attitude. A certain Marianazzo, in refusing a pardon offered him, said: "I prefer to live as a bandit, for thus I find greater consideration and safety."

The Pope, realizing his political error, dropped all the confiscation proceedings. But it was too late. Moreover, Gregory was never happy in his political designs. The league that he attempted to form against the infidels was dissolved: Venice withdrew from it to make peace with the Ottomans; Philip II himself concluded a truce with the Turks. The steps taken by Gregory to oppose Elizabeth's persecution, to sustain the League in France, to intervene in Portugal between rivals for the throne, were crowned with no better success. In his last illness he was often heard to say: *"Tu exsurgens, Domine, misereberis Sion."* [45] But his diplomatic failures should not make us forget the importance of his great reforms.

Sixtus V

The internal dissensions that disturbed the States of the Church at Gregory's death were but superficial. A strong hand sufficed to remove them. The Roman Church, its savor lessened and its brightness dimmed at the close of the fifteenth century and the beginning of the sixteenth, again appeared, thanks to the pontificate of St. Pius V and Gregory XIII, as the salt of the earth and the light of the world. Another great pontiff, Sixtus V, undertook to restore to her, under new forms, the strong internal organization and the political and social hegemony which she had lost since the Middle Ages.

There is nothing to indicate that Sixtus V ever exercised, as has been charged, the occupation of a swineherd. Being the son of an humble gardener in the Marches of Ancona, it is possible that in early childhood he may have tended some swine. What we do know with certainty about his youth is that, when nine years old, he entered the Franciscan monastery at Montalto, that three years later he took the monk's habit, that he made rapid progress there, and already had a reputation as a preacher at the age of nineteen. His sermons in the Church of the Holy Apostles at Rome in Lent, 1552, showed uncommon eloquence, a profound grasp of theology, and particularly a knowledge of men and affairs that was surprising in a young monk, scarcely thirty years old. St. Ignatius Loyola and St. Philip Neri, who heard him, took him into their friendship; Cardinal Caraffa (the future Paul IV) and Cardinal Ghisleri, who became St. Pius V, often visited him in his monastic cell; the noble Colonna family boasted of its friendly intercourse with him. Everyone saw in Fra Felice Peretti—such was the young monk's name—a man destined to become some day a pillar of God's Church. He was successively prior, general of his Order, bishop, cardinal, and, at the death of Gregory XIII, was unanimously chosen pope.

---

[45] "Thou shalt arise, O Lord, and have mercy on Sion." (Ps. 101:14.)

His first care was to suppress brigandage. Thanks to salutary punishments, thanks especially to the coöperation which he was able to exact from the needs of the other States of the peninsula, the bands of brigands disappeared.

The sad plight of the papal exchequer was the second plague of the papal domain. Sixtus V remedied this by a financial system that we have no need to set forth here. The chief elements were an increase in the number of salable public offices and the organization of *monti,* or public loans, either redeemable or not. Only an active, watchful control could escape the risks of this system. But the new Pope was capable of exercising such control. The salable offices were granted only to competent and worthy persons; the operation of the *monti* was subjected to a strict supervision. Soon a treasury of three million scudi in gold and one million in silver testified to the success of these undertakings.

The reëstablishment of public order in the States of the Church and the prosperity of the papal finances were, in the Pope's mind, merely preliminary measures.

The central government of the Church no longer corresponded to the new needs of the times. The multiplicity and variety of affairs which the Pope had to treat required that he have about him especially competent men to handle these matters properly. It was this consideration that prompted the formation of two "congregations," that of the Council and that of the Index, by Pius IV and Pius V. Not only did Sixtus V confirm and extend the powers of these two congregations, but he generalized the system and divided the various matters among fifteen congregations, which constituted, as it were, so many ministries. He took thought also of the organization and membership of the Sacred College. The number of cardinals was fixed at seventy and divided into three orders: six cardinal bishops, fifty cardinal priests, and fourteen cardinal deacons, requiring for admission to their ranks that the candidates be tonsured clerics with minor orders. He enlarged the Vatican printing establishment, where he published an official edition of the Vulgate, a difficult and considerable work, which was finished in 1590.

As European States were acquiring greater autonomy, it was important that Rome, the center of Christendom, should impress the world with her supremacy by her sovereign majesty. Sixtus planned to make Rome so great and beautiful that everyone, monarch or subject, visiting it, would recognize it as the capital of the world. The colossal aqueducts that he constructed after the example of the ancient Caesars, the monumental obelisk which he moved to the front of the Vatican Basilica, the majestic cupola of St. Peter's which he was so eager to see rise and in the construction of which he employed six hundred men, working night and day, the placing on the capital of an ancient Minerva, her spear replaced by an enormous cross, and many other works to which the great Pope's name is still attached, had only one aim in view, an aim recalled by an inscription which Julius II placed in the Strada Julia: "to show the majesty of the newly recovered sovereign dominion."

Sixtus' plans went still farther. He flattered himself with the prospect of putting an end to the Turkish Empire, since he had reached an agreement with Persia in the East and thought that Russia would join the Catholic nations in this enterprise. The conquest of Egypt was also seriously considered by him. He conceived the project of joining the Red Sea and the Mediterranean, thereby reopening the ancient commerce of the world. It was his ambition to organize regular pilgrimages from all countries, even America, to Rome, the universal city and capital of the world. Time and means were lacking to carry out all these plans, some of which were, perhaps, chimerical. But if we reckon merely the undertakings brought to a successful issue, we are seized with admiration when we reflect that a pontificate of only five years sufficed for this great Pope to realize them.

Urban VII, Gregory XIV, Innocent IX, Clement VIII

The pontificates of Urban VII (1590), Gregory XIV (1590–1591), and Innocent IX (1591) were too short to advance the reform work of St. Pius V, Gregory XIII, and Sixtus V. The pious, hard-working Clement VIII (1592–1605) was unfortunately diverted therefrom by numerous and weighty concerns of external policy: the reconciliation of King Henry VI of France with the Holy See, peace negotiations between Spain and France, recovery of the fief of Ferrari, and the execution of the famous Beatrice Cenci and her accomplices.[46] Yet Pope Clement VIII found leisure to publish a new edition of the Breviary, to have a revision made of the Vulgate, and to establish a special commission for the controversies on grace.

---

[46] Cf. Rinieri, *Beatrice Cenci, secondo i constituti del suo processo.*

The celebration of the great jubilee of 1600, which brought three million pilgrims to Rome, testified to the veneration which the Holy See enjoyed at the close of the sixteenth century. After the Rome of the Middle Ages, governing princes and peoples by virtue of a commonly accepted international right, was founded the Rome of modern times, influencing the world by the centralization of her spiritual government, the prestige of her moral greatness and supreme influence.

CHAPTER II

The Catholic Reformation and the Council of Trent

In the Protestant revolt, everything either heralded Luther or followed him; in the Catholic reform movement, everything was either a preparation for the Council of Trent or a consequence of it. The frantic insurrection of one man in the name of individual liberty, and the sage restoration of faith and morals by a hierarchically organized assembly, in the name of tradition: these are the two generative facts of modern times.

Difficulties in the Way of Convocation

The reform of the Church, reform by a council, universal reform from the head to the lowliest members, *in capite et in membris:* these demands, rising on all sides about the middle of the sixteenth century, sometimes so clamorous as even to drown the noise of theological controversy and international strife, the Catholic Church was the first to make heard. Without going back to St. Bernard, St. Peter Damian, or further still—for all the saints were, each in his own way, reformers, and every council was a work of reform—we saw above that at the Council of Vienne (1311) a bishop, commissioned by the Pope to prepare the programme of the council's deliberations, placed at the head of the agenda the celebrated formula: "To reform the Church in head and members."

This formula had been repeated by the legists, the leading scholars of the fifteenth century, and by the Protestants of the sixteenth, and Emperor Charles V took it up on his own account. The legists and Gallican doctors saw therein an occasion to renew in a council the declarations of Constance and Basle; the Protestants purposed setting up, in opposition to the personal authority of the pope, the authority of a representative assembly of the faithful to consecrate their doctrines;[1] the Emperor hoped to find in the reform measures of a future assembly a common ground of mutual agreement between the two parties, Catholic and Protestant, which were disrupting the moral unity and political solidarity of his empire.

The Holy See reluctantly lent itself to the execution of a project pursued with such intentions. Even in the circle about the Pope, among those whose tranquillity was endangered by reform[2] and whose interests ran the risk of being jeopardized, this enterprise encountered systematic opposition. But more and more urgent grew the need of providing a remedy for the perils that beset the Church. Along with the necessity of reforming the Church, there was the need of safeguarding it from a false reform which would be a hundred times worse than the abuses to be cured. On May 22nd, 1542, Paul III published a Bull convoking a universal council on November 1st of that year.[3] After placing himself under the protection of God, the Pope begged everyone's coöperation to assure the integrity of the Christian religion, the reform of morals, the concord of Christian princes and peoples, and the means of repelling the attacks of the infidels. Such was the magnificent programme of the council. From that moment, for more than twenty years—that is, until the final closing of the assembly in 1563—three successive popes, Paul III, Julius III, and Pius IV, in the face of a thousand obstacles, continued the holy undertaking with persevering and prodigious energy.

---

[1] Although Luther and the Protestants several times called for the summoning of a council, they always insisted that it be national, German, as they declared at Smalkalden in February, 1537. They always required, as a preliminary condition, the rejection of the primacy of the pope, as they did at Ratisbon in 1531, when Paul III, out of consideration for the wishes of Charles V, instructed his legate Contarini to arrange some common ground of mutual understanding with them. In the course of the Council of Trent, they followed the same tactics. (Sarpi, *History of the Council of Trent,* p. 118; Pallavicini, bk. 3, ch. 15.)

[2] At the first serious mention of calling a council, the price of all the salable offices at the Roman court fell considerably. Cf. Ruscelli, *Delle lettere di principi* (French translation by Belleforest, *Epitres des princes,* III, bk. 5).

[3] Raynaldi, 1542, no. 13.

After some hesitation, the Pope, in agreement with the Emperor, fixed upon the city of Trent as the place for the meetings of the Council. "This city, located on the Adige River in the Italian Tyrol and ruled by a prince-bishop, Madrucci, in conjunction with a delegate of the Court of Tyrol (Ferdinand, brother of Charles V), was situated at the opening of the lowest Alpine pass and consequently easily accessible from Germany—a fact calculated to give confidence to the Protestants. . . . For one going from France to Italy, Trent was not far from the Turin-Milan-Venice highway. As for the Spaniards, any Italian city would have been equally convenient in the matter of distance." [4]

However, on the day fixed for opening the Council, only a few bishops from Italy and the neighboring regions of Germany were present. In vain the three papal legates waited seven months for the arrival of the other members of the episcopacy and the envoys of Catholic rulers. It seemed that the cause of the Council was lost. Hostilities, which reopened between Francis I and Charles V, were the chief obstacle. After the Peace of Crespy, Paul III (November 19th, 1544) again summoned the episcopate to meet on March 14th, 1545. This postponement was not to be the last. Charles V, besieged by the Protestants, now seemed to hesitate; he would liked to have had a simple congress, like that of Ratisbon, where Catholics and heretics might freely seek a mutual understanding by means of reciprocal concessions. The indefatigable Pontiff, despite his age and labors, redoubled his activity and fixed May 3rd for the opening of the assembly. This time it was France that defaulted. Francis I, vexed on account of all the compromises obtained by his adversary, recalled the four French bishops who had answered the summons.

---

[4] Deslandres, *Le concile de Trente et la réforme du clergé catholique au XVI^e siècle,* p. 8.

Opening of the Council

After fresh negotiations and convocations, on December 13th, 1545, the solemn opening session was celebrated by four cardinals, four archbishops, five generals of religious Orders, three abbots, and thirty-five theologians. Paul III had enjoined that they should proceed to their labors, whatever might be the number of those present.

The Pope did not preside in person over the Council, and his two successors imitated his prudent reserve. But he chose as legates, to speak in his name and to act in his place, three eminent cardinals; Giovanni Maria del Monte, who succeeded him as Julius III, Michele Cervini, afterwards Pope Marcellus II, and Reginald Pole, the astute and active diplomat who, though exiled from England, his fatherland, because of the independence of his loyalty, was to show the same courageous loyalty in defense of the Roman Church.

After the solemn opening ceremonies of the Council, the assembled prelates at Trent took account of the extreme seriousness of their mission. The regrettable delays attending their gathering had given time for the malcontents to bestir themselves, for passions to be let loose, and for the Protestant revolt to gain ground. All the old heresies of the Middle Ages —those of the Vaudois, Albigenses, Beghards, Brethren of the Free Spirit, Wyclifites, and Hussites—seemed to be concentrated in Protestantism. All the ecclesiastical abuses formerly suppressed by Gregory VII and Innocent III, seemed to arise again in the Church. It was a question of defending or reconstructing the whole *ensemble* of dogma and discipline.

In the liturgical processions and solemn prayers at the beginning of their labors, the fathers of Trent doubtless saw above them, with the eyes of faith, the Spirit of Wisdom and Knowledge who had assisted the fathers of Nicea, Ephesus, and the Lateran. They likewise remembered that for three centuries the genius of a great saint had given Catholic theology remarkable precision and clearness. In the midst of their assembly hall they placed, as a treasure whence they would draw sound doctrine, the *Summa* of St. Thomas.[5] For some time past Scholastic theology had taken on new life. The need of wrestling with Protestantism had led it to abandon the abstract and futile discussions which overloaded it in the preceding century. It was worthily represented at the Council of Trent. The young and valiant Society of Jesus sent the eloquent Salmeron, one of the first companions of St. Ignatius, the learned Claude le Jay, whom the bishop of Augsburg had chosen as his procurator, and the illustrious Lainez, future general of the Order, who was to hold so important a place in the Council. The Order of St. Dominic was represented by its vicar-general, Dominic Soto, the theological light of his time, the celebrated Melchior Cano, professor at the University of Alcala, in whom were joined the elegance and scholarship of the humanist and the science of the theologian, the earnest Ambrose Catharinus, of fervent piety, profound knowledge, and hardy thought even to the point of temerity. Louis Carvajal, philosopher and theologian, André de Vega, professor at Salamanca, Bernardine d'Asti, general of the Capuchins, and the eloquent bishop of Bitonto, Cornelius Musso, represented the sons of St. Francis.

---

[5] There is a frequently repeated Dominican tradition that the *Summa* of St. Thomas was placed "on the altar" by the fathers of the Council of Trent, at the side of the Bible and the papal bullaria. We have been unable to find mention of this fact in any contemporary document. Neither Soto nor Cano, both Dominicans who were present at the Council, nor the Dominican Gravina, who vigorously defended the teaching of St. Thomas at the beginning of the seventeenth century, makes the slightest allusion to any such homage paid to the Angelic Doctor. Father Sabatier, in the *Bulletin Critique* (October, 1902, p. 587), denied the validity of the tradition. Father Déodat Marie, a Franciscan, and several of his brethren in religion, took up the question in the *Bonne Parole* (October and November, 1908; January to June, 1909). From these studies it would seem that the Dominican tradition is a legend of which the first written trace is to be found in Gonet's *Clypeus thomisticus,* which appeared at the close of the seventeenth century. In the tenth edition, Gonet declared that he spoke *"sine teste,"* solely relying on the tradition of the Friars Preachers. He then refers to a certain cleric regular, Thomas Aquinas of Naples, who asserts, in his *De politica christiana* (bk. 2, ch. 6), that he has it from trustworthy witnesses that in the assembly hall of the Council there was "a table laden with a holy weight of books," among which was the *Summa* of St. Thomas; *"mensam extitisse sacro librorum pondere gravem, in qua hi sacri codices conspiciebantur, Sacra Scriptura, et sanctiones ac decreta Pontificum, sancti Thomae Summa."* On this question, see the *Revue du Clergé Français,* August 1st, 1909.

The fathers' first care was to determine the order of business. The Pope, to ward off the Protestant danger as soon as possible, desired that the Council begin with questions of faith. On the other hand, the Emperor, wishing to satisfy his Lutheran subjects, through Cardinal Madrucci of Trent demanded that the reform of the discipline be first taken up. The fathers, in a spirit of conciliation, decided that both doctrinal and disciplinary subjects would be discussed simultaneously.[6] Three large committees were formed, each presided over by one of the three legates.[7] "The reason this measure was adopted by the general assembly," says Pallavicini, "was the desire to treat more subjects in less time and to debate them with less confusion; but the legates, in their inner minds, proposed by this division to break up the factions and leagues into which the bishops might be led through yielding to the influence of some vehement, eloquent, and stirring orator." [8]

From the outset there was reason to fear that the discussions would become too animated, that various currents, hard to stem later on, would be formed among the fathers of the Council. Questions of schools of thought divided the sons of St. Francis and those of St. Dominic, or, as someone said, the Cordeliers and the Jacobins. Moreover, the bishops from the four great nations represented in the Council—Germany, France, Spain, and Italy—readily formed four distinct groups. The German prelates, under the Emperor's influence, demanded the reform of the Church first of all; the French, too much dominated by the vacillating policy of Catherine de' Medici, inclined rather toward measures agreeable to the Protestants; the Spaniards held out strongly for the prerogatives of the episcopacy; the Italians were ready for an ardent defense of the privileges of the Roman Court. These last were by far the most numerous. The fathers wisely decided that the greatest liberty of discussion should prevail, but that the Council would determine its own policy and that dogmatic definitions would be by unanimous vote.

---

[6] Theiner, *Acta genuina concilii tridentini,* I, p. 41.

[7] *Ibid.,* p. 43.

[8] Pallavicini (Migne ed.), II, col. 62.

The Bible and the Rule of Faith

The first three sessions were devoted to the work of organization and regulation. In the fourth, fifth, and sixth sessions the fathers approached the Protestant question in its most fundamental aspect.

To acknowledge no rule of faith but the Scriptures as interpreted by private judgment, to hold that human nature is essentially corrupted to its very depth, and to hope for salvation only by external application of Christ's merits, independently of good works—such, as we have seen, was the Lutheran doctrine in its essentials.

The chief consequences of this system were the revolt against the authority of the Church and tradition, rejection of free will, and denial of any internal renovation in the soul of the justified sinner.

It was a bold move to attack, at the first stroke, the Protestant thesis in its fundamental principles. The Pope spiritedly urged it. But the Emperor was no less energetically opposed. "He wrote to Cardinal Pacheco and charged Dandini, papal nuncio at his court, to send word to the legates that it was needful to proceed slowly in this matter and that no anathema should be pronounced against the Protestants, lest they become still more furious." [9]

Some of the fathers were alarmed and urged that great circumspection be used in the matter. The majority disregarded the supposed danger and went on with the programme. Then was taken up the question of the authority of Sacred Scripture and tradition, and a deep and lively discussion began. The most extreme opinions were voiced. Some considered that "it was a spiritual tyranny to hinder the faithful from exercising their minds according to the talents God had given them and to oblige them to remain attached to the single meaning of the Fathers." Richard du Mans, on the contrary, held that "the Scholastics had so clearly expounded the doctrines of faith that one should no longer learn them from Scripture." [10] Cornelius Musso declared that between Scripture and tradition there is only an accidental difference, since both are equally the word of God.[11] The Jesuit, Claude le Jay, and the Dominican, Dominic Soto, wisely remarked that it was necessary to distinguish the matter of faith and morals on which recourse must be had to the traditional interpretation, but that, for the rest, there was no harm in leaving each one the liberty of thinking and writing, without wronging piety and charity.[12]

The result of these theological discussions, which were summed up at a general assembly (April 1st, 1546), as also the observations of canonists and exegetes on the canon of the Sacred Books, was the important decree *"De Canonicis Scripturis"* (April 8th, 1546), wherein the Council, after fixing the canon of the Sacred Books and declaring that the Vulgate translation should be held as the official text and "as authentic in public addresses, disputations, sermons, and expositions, proclaimed, 'for the suppression of petulancy of mind,' that, in matters pertaining to faith or morals, no one should attribute to Scripture a sense other than that which our holy mother the Church has given and does give." [13] The Protestants, as has been well said, "in attempting to strengthen the faith of all Christians in the Sacred Books, succeeded only in imperilling both the Christian religion and the Bible: the Roman Church, proclaiming, at the Council of Trent, the authority of tradition, saved both." [14]

---

[9] Pallavicini, bk. 6, ch. 7, no. 17; Sarpi, I, p. 202.

[10] Fleury, *Histoire ecclésiastique,* bk. 142, nos. 73, 74.

[11] Pallavicini, bk. 6, ch. 14, no. 3.

[12] Fleury, bk. 142, no. 74.—On Lejay's intervention, see Pallavicini, bk. 6, ch. 11, no. 8.

Original Sin

When the question of original sin came up at the fifth session of the Council, the Emperor renewed his requests. He informed the Pope, through the Cardinal of Trent, "that he would be greatly displeased if the article were proposed." [15] But the papal legates upheld the programme fixed upon. The theologians engaged in the freest discussion (May 21st, 1546) on the nature of original sin, the manner of its transmission, its effects, and its remedy. St. Thomas had deeply explored these questions, which the prolonged controversies against the Pelagian heresy had aroused long since. The three schools—Dominican, Franciscan, and Augustinian—professed different theories to explain the state of the first man, his fall, and the

[13] Denzinger, nos. 783–786.—Cf. Theiner, I, p. 49.

[14] Loisy, *Histoire du canon de l'Ancien Testament,* p. 256. See especially book 3, chapter 1, entitled, *"Le concile de Trente et le canon de l'Ancien Testament."*

[15] Sarpi, I, p. 202; Pallavicini, bk. 7, nos. 1–3.

manner in which the consequences of that fall affect posterity. While the disciples of St. Thomas maintained that our first parent was *created* in the state of original justice, the school of St. Bonaventure taught that this supernatural justice could have been communicated to him by God only after an act of the will on Adam's part. Despite the authority of St. Thomas, who made original sin consist mainly in the privation of original justice, the spiritual sons of St. Augustine considered it to be the fact of concupiscence and explained its transmission by a sort of Traducianism. Shortly before the opening of the Council, the Dominican Catharinus did not hesitate to attack at the same time all the theories previously advanced. How, said he, can we be responsible for a fault that is not personal to us? To justify the doctrine of original sin, he argued, our will had been implicated "in a certain manner, in God's eyes," in the will of our first parents.[16] For a time it seemed that Catharinus' eloquence and his cogent dialectic would compel the adherence of the fathers of the Council. But they did not yield to that movement, for the ardent Dominican's theory had no support in Patristic tradition.

On another point tradition was invoked by both sides. Was the transmission of original sin universal? Was the Blessed Virgin preserved therefrom? The latter was energetically sustained by the Franciscans, supported by the Jesuits Lainez and Salmeron; the Dominicans appealed to the authority of St. Thomas to defend the former. Then there was another subject of controversy: an old formula, going back to Venerable Bede, stated that man was, by original sin, wounded in his natural faculties (*vulneratus in naturalibus*). This expression pleased those who wanted to strike the Lutheran heresy as gently as possible.

---

[16] "*Peccatum nostrum . . . habet rationem culpae, quia aliquo modo in patre eramus coram oculis Dei.*" (Ambrosius Catharinus, *De casu hominis et peccato originali,* disp. 5, p. 183.) This doctrine, admitted by Salmeron and criticized by Bellarmine, is entirely abandoned to-day.

The dispute waxed hot. The minutes of the conciliary committees and the reports of ambassadors to their rulers breathe the ardor and fever of battle. But the decree of the Council is calm and moderate. With perfect delicacy, the fathers refrained from deciding any of the questions freely discussed in the Catholic schools. They were assembled, they said, to repress a redoubtable and openly declared heresy, not to restrain liberty of thought among loyal defenders of the Church. Only on belief in the Immaculate Conception, while judging that the question was not yet timely, they expressed their inner sentiment in a clear manner. They declared and defined: (1) that the first man, fallen by his disobedience from the state of holiness and justice in which he had been constituted, in regard both to soul and body, transmitted to his descendants, not only corporal penalties, but that sin itself; (2) that this sin, transmitted to all, not by imitation, but by propagation, can be effaced only by the merits of Jesus Christ, applied to each soul, whether adult or infant, by the Sacrament of Baptism; (3) that Baptism remits and removes from the soul everything that is in the nature of sin, but leaves subsisting there concupiscence, which is not a sin, unless in the sense that it comes from sin and inclines to sin; (4) that, in this decree on original sin, the council does not mean to speak of the Blessed Virgin Mary, Mother of God.[17]

Justification

There remained the question of justification. It was the most fundamental point of Lutheran doctrine. The Wittenberg friar found his most pathetic accents of eloquence in attacking the pretended Pelagian doctrine of free will and good works, in glorifying the mercy of God, who justified man by His sole merits and covered the leprosy of inexpiable sin with the mantle of His infinite goodness. When he spoke of it, it was as if his whole tormented interior life vibrated within him. No other doctrine struck such rude blows at Catholic dogma; for, as Adolph Harnack recognizes, "with this doctrine Luther opposed not only the Scholastics, but also the Church Fathers, yes, Augustine himself."[18]

---

[17] Denzinger, nos. 787-792.

The fathers trembled for a moment before the greatness of their task. The Scholastics, even St. Thomas, who on the question of original sin had been of such great help to them, offered little light on this point. Twenty years of warm controversy had illumined one by one the various aspects of the question; but no one had yet elaborated a synthesis of it. Cardinal Michele Cervini called attention to this fact and added that it would not suffice to declare: Luther has said such and such a thing, therefore it is false; but the error would have to be searched and examined without prepossession; that it also behoved them not to fall into a contrary excess, as happened to Pighius, who, in combating the Lutheran error on original sin, fell into the Pelagian heresy.

Cardinal Pacheco proposed that the question be studied by the special commissions of theologians. Cardinal Pole asked that the divine assistance be implored with all the more fervor as the question appeared most difficult. At the meeting of June 21st, 1546, a commission of theologians reduced to six points the chief questions connected with the doctrine of justification.[19] In following sessions there came to light the two tendencies that divided the council into Thomists and Scotists, the former seeming to attribute more to God's action, while the latter seemed to emphasize the free coöperation of man. At times the debate grew quite animated. Pallavicini relates, according to the acts of the council and the journal of its secretary, Massarelli, how, on July 17th, San Felice, bishop of La Cava, was so far beside himself as to seize the beard of the one disputing with him.[20]

---

[18] Harnack, *Outlines of the History of Dogma*, p. 552. We may add that Luther's system was opposed to St. Paul himself, as several Protestants of our day recognize, for instance, Sabatier, *L'apôtre Paul*, pp. 319–321. Denifle, in the first appendix to his *Luther und Luthertum*, shows by verified texts in the most reliable manuscripts, that, without exception, all authors until Luther understood the "*justitia Dei*" as the Council of Trent defined it, "*non qua ipse* [*Deus*] *justus est, sed qua nos justos facit.*" From this we may see what is to be thought of assertions like Hoffding's, "Christianity was here really brought back to the original principle from which it had sprung . . . Luther took as his foundation the Pauline doctrine of justification by faith." (Hoffding, *A History of Modern Philosophy*, I, p. 39.)

[19] Theiner, I, p. 159.

The result of these impassioned but profound labors was the celebrated *Decretum de Justificatione,* embracing sixteen chapters and thirty-three canons, which, in the consensus of all theologians, must be regarded as the masterpiece of the Council of Trent. Its redaction was largely the work of the learned Cardinal Michele Cervini. After forcibly affirming the inexpressible weakness of man (chap. 1) and Christ's infinite mercy (chaps. 2 and 3), the Council describes in precise and striking terms the progress and work of grace in the soul of of a sinner who returns to God (chaps. 4, 5, and 6), the essential elements of justification (chap. 7), and its gratuitous nature (chap. 8); it condemns the false idea of faith held by Protestants (chap. 9), and deduces from the Catholic doctrine certain important consequences concerning the observance of the commandments, the gift of perseverance, the merits of good works, etc. (chaps. 10 to 16). Like Luther, the fathers affirm that the forgiveness of sins and of the penalty due them can come only from the merits of Christ; but they add that these merits are powerful enough to effect in a repentent man an interior renovation, and that such is the only admissible meaning of the expressions of St. John and St. Paul when they describe the effects of grace as a freeing from sin,[21] an abiding peace,[22] an invincible power,[23] a renovation,[24] and a resurrection of the soul.[25]

---

[20] *Ibid.,* p. 192. *"Rixa inter episcopos cavensem et chironensem."* (Pallavicini, bk. 8, ch. 6, nos. 1, 2.) The Bishop of Cava, excommunicated for this act, was subsequently freed from the censures incurred and permitted to resume his place in the Council.

When the year 1546 came to an end, the decree on justification was not yet promulgated. Events of exceptional gravity threatened to bring about the dissolution of the Council. The Protestants had taken up arms, and Charles V, fearing that the condemnation of the fundamental doctrine of the Reformers would exasperate them, brought all his authority to bear on the German bishops to prevent the publication of the decrees of the sixth session. There was talk of suspending or transferring the Council. But the Pope was opposed to the former solution, and when the latter was mentioned to the Emperor, he grew very angry. The crushing defeat of the Lutherans by the imperial forces settled the question. The decree on justification was promulgated January 13th, 1547, amidst universal acclamations at a public general assembly, and the seventh session opened.

The study of the Sacraments in general was now begun. The question how justifying grace is obtained, increased, and recovered through the Sacraments, was the first corollary to the question of justification. As Harnack says, Luther "here opposed Augustine no less than the Scholastics.[26]. . . Luther destroyed the Catholic doctrine of the Sacraments, not simply the seven. Through the three sentences: (a) the Sacraments contribute unto the forgiveness of sin and nothing else; (b) *sacramenta non implentur dum fiunt, sed dum creduntur;* (c) they are a particular form of the redemptive word of God (of the *promissio Dei*) and therefore have their virtue in the historical Christ—he transformed the sacramental elements into sacramental ordinances." [27] In thirty canons the Council reaffirmed and stated in more precise terms the traditional doctrine of the Sacraments in general, and of Baptism and Confirmation in particular.

---

[21] John, 8:24.

[22] John., 14:27.

[23] John, 16:23.

[24] Tit., 3:5.

[25] Col., 3:1.

[26] Harnack, *Outlines of the History of Dogma*, p. 552.

The Sessions Interrupted

The Council of Trent was about to continue its labors when a new obstacle arose. An epidemic broke out in the city. Two bishops died suddenly. The legates, by virtue of special powers received from the Pope, declared the Council transferred to Bologna. Thereupon Charles V was sorely vexed and kept the prelates of his dependence at Trent. The fathers who remained at Trent dared not perform any synodal act, and those assembled at Bologna contented themselves, from the eighth to the twelfth session, with preparing material, but published no decrees. The Emperor, dissatisfied with this inaction, then resolved to act by himself. At Augsburg he convoked two Catholic doctors and the Protestant Agricola and had them draw up a profession of faith in thirty-six articles, which he intended to impose on the Christian world while awaiting the definitive decrees of the Council: it is known as the Interim of Augsburg.[28] This merely added to the disorder, and Paul III ordered the Cardinal Legate, del Monte, to dissolve the Council.

Two months later (in December, 1549), Paul III died and the conclave chose for his successor the same Cardinal del Monte, who took the name of Julius III. This change in the papacy permitted a change in tactics. The new Pope's first act was to reconvoke the Council at Trent.

[27] *Ibid.*

[28] On the Interim of Augsburg, its origin, publication, opponents, and results, see Janssen, IV, pp. 672, 681.

There it resumed its sessions and on May 1st, 1551, under the presidency of the Cardinal Legate Crescenzio, assisted by two bishops. Thanks to the long and patient labors of the theologians Cano, Lainez, and Salmeron during the five sessions at Bologna, it seemed that the work would be rapid and fruitful. The Emperor favored the resumption of the Council. But a new incident all but spoiled everything.

This time the difficulties arose on the side of France. Henry II, who was at variance with the Pope in consequence of a quarrel over the city of Parma, forbade the French bishops to take part in the Council of Trent and announced a coming meeting of a national council. A letter which Jacques Amyot, abbot of Bellozane, presented to the Council in the King's name, provoked a tempest. At the mere reading of the superscription: "To the holy assembly" (*sacro conventui*), the fathers cried out. They were a true council, not a vague gathering! And it did not pertain to the King of France thus to treat the representatives of the Church universal! In vain did the gentle and docile ambassador try to show that the word *conventus* is, in good Latin, a term of honor. "Whatsoever I might say," relates Amyot, "they obstinately stuck to that word *conventus*. . . . I went on as gently as I could, yet it was enough to have me imprisoned if I had gone a little too far." [29] Finally the incident was closed by the reading of the royal letter and the promise of a reply to the King of France at the next session.[30]

The Eucharist, Penance, and Extreme Unction

On September 2nd, 1551, the dogmatic discussions were resumed. The subject of the Eucharist was next in order. The question had not only given rise to a great number of disputes in the Catholic schools, it had, as we know, also divided the Protestants. In formulating the condemnations, both Zwingli's symbolism and Luther's heterodox realism must be included. At the same time, in setting forth the true doctrine, there must be avoided any formula that would offend any one of the Catholic schools, to which it was intended to leave complete liberty. The fathers were in the presence of the central dogma of religion, the memorial of all the mysteries, the source of all Christian life, not merely a Sacrament like the others, imparting holiness by an outward sign, but God Himself, the author of all holiness, showing Himself under a visible sign. To avoid a repetition of the painful scenes of excitement between the followers of different schools, they decided "that the theologians, when expressing their views, should support them solely on the authority of Holy Writ, Apostolic tradition, approved councils, constitutions of the sovereign pontiffs, the Church Fathers, and the consensus of the Catholic Church." [31] In order the more surely to strike the Protestant errors, they ruled "that after each error to be condemned, there should be cited the exact places in the heretical books where such error was to be found."

---

[29] Letter of Jacques Amyot (September 1st, 1551). Dupuy, *Mémoires*, p. 26.

[30] On this incident, see Theiner, I, p. 486; Raynaldi, 1551, nos. 29, 32; Le Plat, *Monumenta ad historiam concilii tridentini,* IX, pp. 237–242.

These resolutions were observed. At the thirteenth session (October 11th, 1551), after a solemn Mass and a sermon in praise of the Blessed Sacrament, Archbishop Sassati read the decree on the Eucharist. In words whose majesty admirably suited the loftiness of the doctrine, "the sacred and holy, ecumenical and general Synod of Trent, lawfully assembled in the Holy Ghost, . . . that it might set forth the true and ancient doctrine touching faith and the Sacraments, . . .

---

[31] *"Sententiae per theologos dicendae deducantur ex Scriptura, traditionibus apostolicis, sacris et approbatis conciliis, ac constitutionibus et auctoritatibus Summorum Pontificum et sanctorum Patrum ac consensu catholicae Ecclesiae. Utantur brevitate, et abstineant a superfluis et inutilibus quaestionibus ac etiam protervis contemptionibus."* (Theiner, I, p. 489.)

that it might pluck up by the roots those tares of execrable errors and schisms which the enemy hath, in these our calamitous times, sown in the doctrine of the faith, in the use and worship of the sacred and holy Eucharist, which our Saviour, notwithstanding, left in His Church as a symbol of that unity and charity, . . . teaches and openly and simply professes that, in the sacred Sacrament of the Holy Eucharist, after the consecration of the bread and wine, our Lord Jesus Christ, true God and man, is truly, really, and substantially contained under the species of those sensible things." [32] Then, "since it is not enough to set forth the truth, if errors are not also uncovered and rejected," the Council uttered anathemas against the various forms of Protestant heresy.

In October the consideration of the Sacrament of Penance was begun. The fathers were here in the presence of a doctrine that had been studied at great length by the Scholastics and forcibly expressed by St. Thomas Aquinas. But there was scarcely anything which Luther assailed so passionately as this. By reducing all conditions of forgiveness to interior contrition, and this to faith, by denying, consequently, the value of any external work performed by priest or penitent, Luther, according to Harnack's words, had sought to "destroy the tree of the Catholic Church." [33] The Council, in a decree of nine chapters and fifteen canons, set forth the traditional doctrine and condemned the Protestant errors.

Another decree had just been passed, establishing the Catholic teaching on the Sacrament of Extreme Unction, when, at the close of 1551 and during the first days of 1552, a number of Protestant deputies, yielding to the Emperor's urgent request, appeared at Trent. Charles V hoped to accomplish much for political and religious pacification by the presence of those delegates at the Council. But he was soon to discover his mistake. These Protestants brought to Trent exigent demands and haughty pretensions. Among other things, they required that most of the decrees already passed should be reopened to debate, that the Pope should not preside over the Council either in person or by legates, and that everything should be decided solely by rational interpretation of the Bible.

---

[32] Buckley, *The Canons and Decrees of the Council of Trent,* p. 70.

[33] Harnack, p. 554.

A Ten Years' Interruption

While the preliminaries were dragging on, Maurice of Saxony, the most ardent protector of the Protestants, suddenly threw aside his mask and fell upon Tryol. He very nearly surprised Charles V at Innsbruck and threatened the city of Trent at close range. The Protestant deputation hastily disappeared. Many terrified prelates took to flight. The Pope, promptly informed of the situation, published (April 28th, 1552) a Bull suspending the assembly.

The Council, thus dispersed, did not resume its labors for ten years. The unhappy incidents created by Julius III's nepotism and inconsistent policy, the ill-considered campaign of Paul IV against Spanish domination in Italy, the ensuing coldness between the Pope and Philip II, the political advance of the Protestants, and, in consequence thereof, the strange concessions demanded by the Emperor and the King of France in favor of the Reformers,[34] kept postponing the reopening of the Council of Trent from day to day. Yet time pressed. Rulers were now talking only of national councils, of conferences, colloquies,[35] or even of a universal "free and Christian" council, understood in the Protestant sense. Pius IV, who succeeded Paul IV in 1560, saw the danger and, braving every difficulty, published (November 29th, 1560) a Bull reconvoking the council. More than a hundred bishops answered the summons, and the seventeenth session was opened at Trent, January 18th, 1562.

---

[34] The Emperor and the French court asked: (1) that the new assembly be regarded as a new council and not as the continuation of the preceding; (2) that communion under both species be allowed the laity and that priests be permitted to marry. (Raynaldi, 1560, nos. 55, 56.)

[35] In France preparations were being made for the colloquy of Poissy.

The situation had notably changed during the intervening ten years. Emperor Charles V had retired from the world in 1555 and died at the monastery of Saint Just, in 1558. His successor, Ferdinand I, had no authority in Italy. No longer was there any hope for a reunion of the Protestants. In northern Germany and in England their cause was almost identified with that of the political power. On the other hand, differences were accentuated between the Spaniards, Germans, Italians, and French. The French were amused at the claims of the Italian prelates; the Italians spoke of the "French sickness" and the "Spanish leprosy." Often, after discussions, mobs gathered and altercations arose in the streets with shouts of "Spain! Italy! France!" At Rome it was questioned whether the meeting of a council were not too violent a cure for the feeble body of the Church. However, the work already undertaken could not be abandoned. The question of indulgences, which had given rise to the first external disturbances of Protestantism, the question of the sacrifice of the Mass, concerning which Luther had published his most abusive pamphlets, and the questions of the Sacraments of Holy Orders and Matrimony, which required so many delicate points to be settled, had not yet been touched.

The great problem of the reform of the Church, which had been merely sketched out in the first sixteen sessions, could not remain in suspense. The Sovereign Pontiff, Pius IV, said one day, in a moment of discouragement, that the papacy could no longer be maintained except by a strong union with the rulers. It would seem that he thought to accomplish the reform in his own name with the support of the secular rulers. But he soon recognized that such would be at best an ineffective and perhaps unrealizable half-way measure. The only practical means was to continue the Council, making sure of the adherence of the three great powers, Germany, Spain, and France. Cardinal Morone, who had long enjoyed the sympathy of the house of Austria, entered upon negotiations with Ferdinand. After assurance was given that the theologians would be allowed to meet by nations for the preparation of the decrees and that the work of reform would be actively pushed in the greatest possible accord with the Emperor's desires, Ferdinand promised his coöperation.

The work of the eighteenth session was limited to the publication of a decree on the compilation of a catalogue of forbidden books and a safe-conduct for the Protestants. The next two sessions had to limit themselves to publishing a decree of prorogation. On all sides rulers placed obstacles in the way: France insisted that the assembly be considered a new council; Spain, on the contrary, wanted it to declare itself a continuation of the preceding council. The opposition of these two nations was not, however, irreducible. Philip II, deeply concerned with the difficulties stirred up against the crown by a powerful clergy complaining of the heavy taxes that accumulated on their property, finally gave his unqualified adherence to the Council; he hoped to obtain from it a limitation of the power of his bishops. The Guises, who were then governing France, and whose political interest inclined them to the support of every measure calculated to combat the Protestant party, were easily won in favor of the Council. The Cardinal of Lorraine even went to Rome to propose conditions for an understanding between the Pope, the Emperor, and the Kings of France and Spain. External difficulties were smoothed out. The Council had only to continue its discussions with energy and determination.[36]

The Mass, Holy Orders, Matrimony

The purely doctrinal questions were treated with relative calm. The theologians who, at the outset, hoped to win the Protestants by conciliatory formulas, were disillusioned and no longer sought any attenuation in the statement of Catholic dogma. The decree relative to Holy Communion, published at the 21st session (July 16th, 1562), declared that the Church, having received from God the power to change, in the sacraments, whatever did not affect their substance, henceforth officially approved communion under one species and made this a law for the faithful.

The 22nd session was devoted to the Mass, which the Council proclaimed to be a true expiatory sacrifice for the living and the dead, in no wise derogating from the sacrifice of the Cross, but renewing it under another form. Those were condemned who rejected the use of Latin in the celebration of the Mass or who introduced therein non-religious music. At the 23rd session (July 15th, 1563) was published the decree on the Sacrament of Holy Orders, in four chapters and eight canons. Therein were set forth the sacramental nature of Holy Orders, its indelible character, the preëminence of bishops over priests, and different degrees of the hierarchy, dependent solely on the pope, to the exclusion of any intervention by the people or by secular rulers.

The doctrinal question of Matrimony was the principal subject of the 24th session, which affirmed the power of the Church to establish diriment impediments. The indissolubility of marriage, even in case of adultery, was also defined; but pains were taken in the wording of the canon so as not to anathematize the Greeks, although condemning their error.[37] Banns of matrimony were instituted. Lastly, after long debate, the Council established the impediment of clandestinity under certain conditions which continued until the decree of August 2nd, 1907.

---

[36] Pius IV's diplomatic negotiations, under these circumstances, have been carefully set forth by Ranke, according to archival documents, especially a report of Morone which Sarpi and Pallavicini did not know. (Ranke, I, pp. 256 sqq.)

Disciplinary Questions

During this last period of the Council the liveliest discussions took place on questions of discipline and on doctrinal subjects that in some way touch on matters of discipline. Reform questions treated during the first sixteen sessions concerned preaching (5th session), the duties of bishops, the authority of cathedral chapters during a vacancy of the episcopal see (7th session), episcopal jurisdiction (13th and 14th sessions). No serious objections were stirred up, or at least the burning questions of the divine right of episcopal residence and of the supremacy of the pope and his legates over the council were wisely avoided.[38] The discussions were conducted with unexampled violence from the beginning of the 17th session.

The upper Spanish clergy, proud of their important place in the monarchy, suspected Philip II, who took umbrage at their power, of coming to an agreement with the Pope to restrain their authority within just limits. The habit of striving against the King had given them a high idea of their prerogatives and prepared them to engage in a conflict with the Pope. In the first rank of Spanish prelates, both by the dignity of his position and by the extent of his theological knowledge, was the archbishop of Granada, the fiery Pedro Guerrero. At the 17th session, which marked the reopening of the Council of Trent, Guerrero, using as a pretext a certain expression employed in promulgating one of the conciliar decrees, "on the proposal of the legates" (*proponentibus legatis*), "began," says Pallavicini, "to make a noise and this noise reached the ears of the presiding officers, who directed the secretary, Massarelli, to calm the turbulent bishop."[39] Guerrero flew into a rage, declared that the expression was a novel one, not employed in former councils, and of a nature to make it appear that the Council was not free, an expression calculated to repel Protestants in good faith. A majority of the Council ignored the incident,[40] but in the following sessions the archbishop of Granada took up the subject again under another form.

---

[37] The Venetian ambassadors had asked for this way of handling the question, in favor of the Greeks who were under their domination. (Cf. Pallavicini, bk. 22, ch. 4, no. 27.)

[38] Notably at the fourth and sixth sessions (Pallavicini, bk. 7, ch. 4, no. 9; bk. 6; bk. 9, chs. 1, 2) and in the preparations for the thirteenth session (Pallavicini, bk. 12, ch. 3). Cf. also Pallavicini, bk. 15, ch. 16, 17; bk. 16, ch. 4. "The Pope ran considerable risk if certain questions had been inopportunely brought up . . . At least it was needful that the assembly be under the guidance of persons who were wholly devoted to him. All who were selected were men of great worth. The first legate presided over the council, each of the others over special commissions. By the very force of things, their part was bound to be preponderant. In the presence of an assembly made up of diverse nationalities and of often conflicting interests, they knew what they wanted; they were in touch with all the questions to be introduced or avoided; at every moment they asked instructions from Rome." (Deslandres, p. 18.)

Already at the 4th session the question of the divine right of residence came up in connection with the matter of bishops' preaching. The legates prudently avoided this occasion of sharp controversy. But it became a subject of conversation among the fathers.[41] Was a bishop's residence in his diocese a matter of divine right or simply of ecclesiastical law? Many theologians had clearly decided in favor of the divine right, saying that they could not bring themselves to consider as dependent on a superior's will a duty so essential to the ecclesiastical organization. Moreover, was not a bishop the mystical spouse of his church? Such an opinion, replied those on the other side, is not admissible. To declare that residence is of divine right would be to destroy the authority of the sovereign pontiff, who always had exercised the faculty of employing bishops according to the needs of the Church. The first bishops were without any fixed sees, going from place to place.[42] The Pope directed Cardinal Simonetta to avoid, at any price, a purely speculative controversy, for, as he said, whether residence be of divine or of ecclesiastical right, everybody knows that it is a matter of strict and necessary command and it is more worth while to consider the means of having it observed than to indulge in discussions as to the origin of this obligation. Such, however, was not the opinion of the fathers. Once men are divided on speculative questions, these obsess them with a force and persistence rarely obtained by matters of a purely practical sort; disputes over ideas are frequently more earnest than over matters of personal concern. "During the intervals between the sessions, nothing was talked of but residence, and he would have been regarded as a most stupid man who did not side warmly with one or other of these two opinions." [43]

---

[39] Pallavicini, bk. 15, chap. 16.

[40] The legates had, in fact, *proposed* almost all the questions submitted for debate. Under the circumstances, considering the diversity of nations and interests represented in the Council, so long as there was still any echo of the great controversies over the supremacy of the pope or of the council, this practice was a prudent one. But it was, perhaps, unwise to insert, in so many words, the new formula, *proponentibus legatis*. This served to awaken passions that were scarcely lulled. On the other hand, it would be an exaggeration to say that, during the second period of the Council, the legates were the only ones to introduce questions for discussion. As the sessions continued, the fathers became more experienced. In fact, there were discussions on many topics with the introduction of which the legates had nothing whatever to do.

On April 7th, 1562, in the discussion of an article proposed by the legates in regard to episcopal residence, Guerrero took the floor. "The subject has been proposed," he said; "not to settle it now would be a scandal." "The question," says Pallavicini, "was like an abyss into which everyone precipitated himself in panic without looking at the edge." [44] The legates were divided on the matter. As there seemed no hope of reaching an agreement, the solution was postponed until the question of Holy Orders would come up.

---

[41] Pallavicini, bk. 16, ch. 4, no. 1.

[42] *Ibid.*, bk. 16, ch. 13.

[43] *Ibid.*, bk. 16, ch. 4, no. 2. On this difficult question, see Prat, *Histoire de concile de Trente*, pp. 515–522. Theologians are still divided on the subject. A third opinion was expressed, according to which episcopal residence is of divine right, substantially, but not as to manner.

At the 18th session Guerrero again made himself the spokesman of episcopal and conciliar prerogatives and proposed that in the decrees these words be inserted: "The Council, *representing the universal Church.*" [45] But his motion was lost. At the next session, when urged by one of his Spanish colleagues to assure the Pope of his obedience to the Holy See, he replied: "Let the Pope give us what is ours, and we will give him what is his." [46] At the root of all this opposition was the question of the Council's supremacy over the Pope. But the issue was not faced directly. At Cardinal Morone's interviews with Philip II it was agreed that this irritating subject should be laid aside.[47] Thanks to these measures of prudence, the work of reform could advance by the promulgation of several important decrees on the visitation of dioceses,[48] the life of the clergy,[49] the duties of prelates,[50] the holding of synods, the cumulation of benefices, provisions and expectatives, meetings of regulars [51] and their mode of life.[52] The stormiest session was the 23rd; it was perhaps also the most fruitful because of the decree on the establishment of seminaries, a decree which closed this session, and which alone, we might say, was worth all the labors of the Council.[53]

---

[44] Pallavicini, bk. 16, ch. 4, no. 5.

[45] *Ibid.*, bk. 15, ch. 21, no. 5.

[46] *Ibid.*, bk. 20, ch. 9, no. 11.

[47] *Summarium eorum quae dicuntur inter Caes. majestatem et ill. card. Moronum;* quoted by Ranke, I, p. 258.

[48] Session 21.

[49] Session 22.

[50] Session 23.

[51] These last four questions were treated in session 24.

[52] Session 25.

For three centuries both Catholics and heretics had been calling for a reform of the Church in its head and members (*in capite et in membris*). The Council did not close without accomplishing its full programme. At the 23rd session the impetuous Archbishop Guerrero of Granada forcefully insisted on the reform of the Sacred College. He was on the point of weakening the justice of his plea by the violence of his words when, it is said, the saintly Bishop of Braga, Bartholomew a Martyribus, was seen to rise. He was a friend of St. Charles Borromeo. The austerity of his life and his mystical gifts crowned him, as it were, with a halo of sanctity. "It is my opinion," he said, "that the most illustrious cardinals have need of a most illustrious reform." [54] In accord with this sentiment, the Council declared that the penalties for non-residence applied to cardinals as well as to others; [55] it abolished reservations and expectatives even for cardinals,[56] applied to them the regulations regarding nepotism and prelates' manner of life,[57] and offered for their meditation these fine words (second decree of the 25th session): "Whereas the administration of the universal Church depends upon their advice to the Roman pontiff, it would seem to be shameful if they did not at the same time shine so preëminently in virtue and in the discipline of their lives as deservedly to turn unto themselves the eyes of all men." [58] The Holy Father was declared to be bound by "that solicitude which, by the duty of his office, he owes to the universal Church," [59] and which he should show in the care of the universities placed under his protection.[60] On the other hand, it was declared "that nothing new or that has not previously been in use in the Church shall be decreed without the Roman pontiff having been first consulted," [61] and that the extirpation of abuses should be left to "the sovereign pontiff, by whose authority and prudence that which may be expedient for the universal Church will be ordained." [62]

---

[53] Pallavicini, bk. 21, ch. 8, no. 3.

[54] *"Illustrissimi cardinales indigent, ut mihi quidem videtur, illustrissima reformatione."* This remark, reported in the *Vie de Barthélemy des Martyrs* (bk. 2, ch. 8), is to be found neither in Pallavicini nor in Sarpi. Cf. Baluze, *Miscellanea,* IV, p. 316, and *Revue des Questions Historiques,* July, 1869, p. 60.

[55] Session 23.

[56] Session 24.

[57] Session 25.

[58] Session 25; Buckley, p. 231.

Thus did the Church enact its own reform in head and members. But before final adjournment, the Council of Trent could not forget that the greatest abuses came not from the Church herself, but were due rather to the abusive meddling in church affairs by those rulers who so loudly called for a return to the purity of ecclesiastical life. "Protestantism," says Janssen, "proclaimed that the temporal power alone is of divine right. Naturally Catholic rulers could not admit such a doctrine. Yet long before Luther they had endeavored, according to the principles inculcated by the Roman jurists, to subject to the lay power the temporal concerns of bishoprics. At first they arrogated to themselves the right to dispose of the goods of the Church at pleasure, then the right to make all appointments, and lastly to exercise control over all the ordinances of the clergy. The Catholic duke of Saxony, George the Bearded, said with brutal frankness: 'We pilfer episcopal sees for our brethren and friends; we merely undertake to have our own penetrate the fold; whether it be by the gate or by the wall, matters little to us.' The deterioration of monastic practice, the unwonted and culpable frivolity of most rulers, brought about a prevalent custom of admitting huntsmen, falconers, grooms, and other lackeys to the convents. The clergy were continually complaining of this state of affairs. In 1528 the dukes of Bavaria did indeed forbid licence and buffonery in the cloister; but their orders were no more than 'dust in the wind.' "[63] In France, Spain, and the kingdom of Naples, the Church was no less enslaved.

---

[59] Session 24, ch. 1.

[60] Session 25, ch. 2.

[61] Decree on the invocation of the saints, Session 25; Buckley, p. 215.

[62] Decree on indulgences, Session 25; Buckley, p. 253.

At its 25th session the Council of Trent laid the axe to the root of the evil. Under pain of excommunication it forebade rulers to mix in ecclesiastical affairs, required them to respect the ancient prerogatives of the clergy, refused them the right to confer benefices, forbade them to lay hands on ecclesiastical privileges or church property, adjured the emperors, kings, republics, and all rulers, of every kind and degree, to be watchful that the rights and liberty of the Church be respected.[64]

The fathers of the Council did not hide from themselves the opposition that such injunctions would arouse. Already the Emperor had threatened serious disorders if the articles about "the reform of rulers" were not withdrawn.[65] The young King Charles IX, hearing these articles mentioned, declared: "The fathers of Trent want to trim the claws of kings while sharpening their own. We will never suffer them to touch our prerogatives."[66] But the Pope was inflexible. "His Holiness thinks," wrote Cardinal Otto (September 17th, 1563), "that the reform of the clergy would bear but little fruit if the rulers failed to accept a complete reform."[67]

---

[63] Janssen, IV, pp. 165–169; cf. II, pp. 361–365, and Sugenheim, *Baierns Zustände*, p. 265.

[64] Session 25, *De reform.*, ch. 20; cf. session 7.

[65] Janssen, IV, p. 171.

[66] Letter dated April 28th, 1563; see Le Plat, VI, p. 194.

[67] Letter from Cardinal Otto to Father Johann von Reidt at Cologne, quoted by Janssen, IV, p. 165. It is evident how incorrect is Harnack's opinion about the Council of Trent. He says: "Even at Trent was dogma transformed into politics." (*Op. cit.*, p. 511.) On the contrary, impartial history shows that, although the majority of the Council had due respect for the opinions of all the schools of Catholic thought, they were inflexible even toward princes, kings, and emperor, whenever the higher interests of justice or of faith seemed to them to be at stake.

It was necessary to advance the 25th and last session of the Council. Pius IV, who had been ill for some time, was suffering a severe attack. It was desirable that he should survive the Council, lest it be disturbed by the conflicts incident to the election of a new pope. There was a rumor that France projected a national council, in which Protestant pastors were to take their place side by side with Catholic bishops.[68] Happily the doctrinal questions that remained to be treated—Purgatory, indulgences, devotion to the saints—had been carefully prepared by the theologians at Bologna. The decree on indulgences, which, for want of time, had not been previously introduced, was drawn up on the night of December 3rd, 1563. It could not be omitted without seeming to evade the very question that was the starting-point of militant Protestantism.

On December 4th the secretary, Massarelli, after reading the decrees, stepped to the middle of the assembly. Two hundred and fifty-five prelates were present. "Most illustrious lords and most reverend fathers," he said, "is it your pleasure that we do now bring to a close this holy and ecumenical Council, and that, in the name of this same Council, the presidents do request the Holy Father to confirm all that has been here ordained and defined?"

Each of the fathers in turn expressed his assent by the consecrated formula, *"Placet."* Guerrero alone, the eternal opponent, replied: "I agree to the closing of the Council, but I do not request the confirmation."[69] He doubtless thought that a sufficient confirmation resulted from the ensemble of the acts.

"Thus the conclusion was prosperous," says Ranke. "The Council, so eagerly demanded and so long evaded, twice dissolved, and agitated by so many political tempests, which had even in its third assembly been assailed by dangers so imminent, closed amidst the universal accord of the Catholic world."[70] Thenceforth Catholicism stood before the Protestant world with redoubled and rejuvenated force.[71]

---

[68] Raynaldi, 1563; Prat, p. 230.

[69] Pallavicini, bk. 24, ch. 8, no. 8.

---

[70] Ranke, I, p. 264.

[71] It has sometimes been claimed that, whereas at the Council of Trent the Church freed herself from the influence of rulers, she "unfortunately enslaved herself to Scholasticism and Aristotelianism." To this is due, we are told, a halt or a deviation in the progressive advance of Christian thought. A close study of the dogmatic definitions of the Council would doubtless show how much the fathers of Trent profited by the theological work of the Middle Ages, and particularly by the incomparable synthesis of St. Thomas Aquinas; to what extent also they were able to utilize the wealth of language and thought which Aristotle's philosophy placed at the disposal of theology. But such an inspection would likewise prove that the authoritative mind of the Church, instead of being enslaved to any philosopher's theory, even though he be the genial author of the *Metaphysica* or the *Ethica Nicomachaea*, did, on the contrary, dominate it. Although the decrees of the Council use such words as substance, space, matter, and form, it would be easy to show that these words take on an autonomous sense, deeper and more precise than that which the Aristotelian philosophy had given them, and that perhaps nowhere more than at Trent was philosophy, to use the medieval expression, the humble handmaid of theology (*"ancilla theologiae"*).

CHAPTER III

The Catholic Reformation and Catholic Rulers

"WHEN, as sometimes occurs, a great movement, agitating the whole world, is originated by an individual power, which then constitutes itself the special representative of the principle actuating that movement, the power thus in action takes then so influential a part in the collective operations of the century, it enters into relations so intimate with all the powers of the world that its history, in a certain sense, expands into universal history. Such was the epoch upon which the papacy entered at the close of the Council of Trent. Convulsed to its center, endangered in the very groundwork of its being, it had not only maintained itself, but found means to gain renewed force. In the two southern peninsulas, all influences hostile to its ascendancy had been promptly expelled, all the elements of thought and action had been once more gathered to itself and pervaded by its own spirit. It now conceived the idea of subduing the revolt in all other parts of the world. Rome once more became a conquering power, projects were formed and enterprises engaged in, recalling those proceeding from the Seven Hills in ancient times and during the Middle Ages." [1]

Situation of the Church

From an outside point of view, the situation of the Church, following the Council of Trent, appeared to be extremely critical and the Catholic cause seemed lost. Two-thirds of Europe had entered the ranks of heresy, which infested the two great nations on which the Church most relied in the Middle Ages. "A Venetian ambassador calculated, in the year 1558, that only a tenth part of the German people still adhered to the ancient religion.[2] In 1561 the Venetian ambassador Micheli found no province of France free from Protestantism; three-fourths of the kingdom were filled with it." [3] Italy and Spain, taken as a whole, remained Catholic; but among the people vague rumblings of heresy were heard. Of Catholic rulers, even those who lent their devoted support to the Council now chafed at seeing the Catholic reform extend to themselves and refused to promulgate the decrees of Trent. Philip II published the *Decreta Tridentina,* but with a reservation as to "the prerogatives of the crown." Catherine de' Medici declared that she was ready to execute the Council's decisions in particular, but refused to make a general promulgation of them. Henry IV did, indeed, promise to carry them out, but he did not keep his promise.[4]

---

[1] Ranke, I, pp. 394 sqq. This chapter of Ranke is one of the most remarkable summaries ever written of the Catholic reform after the Council of Trent. It has lost none of its value to-day.

A closer examination of the situation, however, was apt to give the Church full confidence. Eminent prelates, assisted by theologians of consummate knowledge and deliberating with the aid of the Holy Ghost, had proclaimed in calm and majestic language the ancient dogmas that were contested by heresy and had enriched them with new precision. As Ranke says: "The Protestant spirit alone had hitherto filled the theatre of the world with results that held the minds of men enthralled; another spirit . . . now entered the lists, displaying similar power to make the minds of men its own, and to kindle them into activity. . . . In the Council so prosperously concluded, the popes had even gained an accession of that authority which it had been the purpose of the temporal powers to restrict, and had strengthened their influence over the national churches. . . . Thus strengthened internally, thus supported by powerful adherents and by the idea of which they were the representatives, the popes exchanged the defensive position, with which they had hitherto been forced to content themselves, for that of assailants." [5]

---

[2] Ranke, p. 401.

[3] *Ibid.,* p. 403.

[4] The decrees had to be accepted by the Catholic rulers in order to have the force of civil laws. On the obstacles in the way of their acceptation in France, see Baguenault de Puchesse, *Histoire du concile de Trente,* pp. 272–292, where an exact and ample treatment of the question will be found. With perfect truth it has been remarked that, although France deferred publishing the decrees of the Council, yet she accepted and applied their spirit. At a meeting in 1615, the bishops decided to publish the decrees in their respective dioceses. The Catholic States of Germany, as also Portugal, Poland, Venice, and the chief States of Italy, accepted the decrees of the Council without restriction.

They were encouraged to do so by the internal state of Protestantism, which, notwithstanding an almost complete external triumph, was everywhere torn by intestinal dissensions. To the sacramentary quarrel, which had not ceased being a source of disturbance, there was added wrangling and dispute by various groups—the Antitrinitarians, who claimed doctrinal descent from Michel Servet; the Majorists, who took their name from Michel Major and defended the efficacity of good works; the Mennonites, who, following Menno Simons, rejected oaths, war, and absolute predestination; the Crypto-Calvinists, who invoked the authority of Melanchthon; the Mystics of Schwenkfeld; the Synergists of Pfeffinger; the Osiandrists, and the Armenians. Germany in particular was troubled by the Anabaptists, who pursued the utopia of a theocratic kingdom without laws or rulers, in which perfect equality and community of possessions would reign. The Socinians, denying the divinity of Christ, the reality of original sin, and the supernatural value of the sacraments, passed from Germany into Switzerland and Poland. The Protestant Church of the Netherlands was divided on the question of absolute predestination. The Church of England saw the formation of the three sects that were to divide her followers into Episcopalians, Presbyterians, and Independents.

---

[5] Ranke, I, pp. 407, 409.

Favorable Attitude of Catholic Rulers

The social disturbances provoked by these disputes, while weakening the Protestants, facilitated the action of the Church by winning to her, in certain directions, the support of rulers who were concerned with repressing the turbulence of the reformed sects. The principle, often proclaimed by Protestantism, that the religion of a State depends upon that of the ruler, turned sharply against it.[6] Duke Albert V of Bavaria closed his frontiers to heresy, obliged the professors of the University of Ingolstadt to sign the profession of faith published by the Council of Trent, and entrusted the education of youth to the Jesuits. Ecclesiastical princes hastened to follow this example. The prince-abbot of Fulda, Balthasar von Dernbach, who was elected in 1570, favored the extirpation of heresy with all his might. In 1572 James von Eltz, prince-elector of Treves, excluded Protestants from his court. These examples were followed by others: in 1574 by the archbishop-elector of Mayence, in 1582 by the bishop of Würzburg, in 1585 by the bishop of Paderborn. The duke of Austria in 1587 adopted similar measures. Archduke Ferdinand extended them to Styria, Carinthia, and Carniola in 1598.

"The imperial power," says Ranke, "was neither sufficiently strong nor sufficiently resolute to come to any effectual decision regarding it [*i. e.* the declaration of the peace of Augsburg], still less to make it respected. Even in the diets of the empire there was not the energy or the unanimity that would have been required to procure the adoption of measures in its favor. The most important changes occurred without a word of remark, almost without observation; they were not even mentioned by the historians of the period, but passed as things inevitable and that could not be otherwise." [7] Southern Germany and all of Austria thus returned to Catholicism. In France, while Edmund Auger's [8] eloquence and the fame of Maldonatus' [9] teaching drew crowds about Catholic professors and preachers and away from the sermons of the Huguenots, public opinion, feeling that national unity was endangered by the Protestants, turned to the Guises and greeted the League as an instrument of freedom. The attempts at Catholic restoration by Queen Mary in England, by King John in Sweden, and by Mary Stuart in Scotland, did not attain any lasting result, but bore witness to the revival of Catholic feeling. In the Netherlands the League of Arras laid the foundation of the Catholic kingdom of Belgium and, under the influence of St. Charles Borromeo, the seven Swiss cantons that had remained faithful to Rome founded the Golden League for the defense of the true faith.

---

[6] *Ibid.*, p. 419.

Popes St. Pius V, Gregory XIII, Sixtus V, and Urban VIII presided over this movement, which has been called the Catholic Counter-Reformation.

But the Church, while gratefully accepting the help of secular powers when these do not encroach beyond the limits of their competency, counts especially, in the work of self-regeneration and the salvation of souls, on the canonical means which her divine constitution gives her the right to employ.

The Inquisition

For the defense of her children against heresy, the Church organized two great institutions: the Roman Inquisition and the Index.

---

[7] *Ibid.,* p. 431.

[8] Edmond Auger (1530–1591) was born at Alleman, near Troyes. He joined the Jesuits, taught the humanities in Italy, preached in France, and was Henry III's confessor.

[9] On Maldonatus, see chapter 27.

We have seen how, in 1542, Pope Paul III by the Bull *"Licet ab initio"* centralized the different particular tribunals of episcopal and monastic inquisition that were in operation since the twelfth century and established a supreme tribunal of inquiry for the whole Church: this was the Roman Inquisition. It could reach bishops and cardinals as well as the simple faithful. Under Paul IV, Cardinals Morone and Pole, notwithstanding the renown of their services, were haled before the new tribunal. Pius V raised the number of cardinal inquisitors to eight and conferred very extensive powers on them. Lastly Sixtus V, by his constitution *"Immensa aeterni Dei,"* which reorganized the whole Roman curia, made the Holy Office, or Universal Congregation of the Inquisition (*Sacrum Officium seu Universa Inquisitionis Congregatio*), the first of the fifteen congregations of cardinals among which he distributed all the business of church government. Furnished with the full powers of a tribunal, it had competency in all cases relative to the faith, from heresy to the abuse of the Sacraments, and exercised jurisdiction in all countries where the Catholic religion existed.

The procedure of the Inquisition differed from ordinary inquiries: the facts appealed to in the accusation had to be communicated to the accused, but the names of the deponents were always kept secret; if the charges were not rejected, the accused, instead of taking the ordinary oath, had to make an abjuration of heresy; the inquiry, in a case of heresy, might involve the gravest penalties, notably degradation and transfer to the hands of the civil power; after the decisions of Innocent IV, published in 1552, torture, which was forbidden in ordinary ecclesiastical tribunals, could be used.[10]

---

[10] These regulations prompt a recent historian of the Inquisition to say: "The Church forgot her early traditions of toleration, and borrowed from the Roman jurisprudence, revived by the legists, laws and practices which remind one of the cruelty of ancient paganism." (Vacandard, *The Inquisition,* p. 158.) "An accused man's confession of crime ought to be free," wrote Pope St. Nicholas I in the ninth

While the Council of Trent was in session, the Inquisition was at work in Italy and Spain. In Italy it nearly everywhere functioned in concert with the civil power. "The governments of Milan and Naples," says Ranke, "could present but slight opposition, because they had themselves intended to establish the Spanish Inquisition in their own territories . . . In Tuscany the Inquisition was rendered accessible to the influence of the civil power . . . The Inquisition for the Venetian States was in some measure subjected to the control of the civil power . . . Many took to flight, and these fugitives were to be found in every town of Germany and Switzerland." [11]

In Spain, where the suppression of heresy was still more severe, it was the civil authority that took the initiative. From the monastery of St. Just, whither he had retired, Charles V wrote (May 25th, 1558) to his daughter: "Were I not certain that you and the members of the council who are by your side would utterly uproot the evil (for it is but a beginning without depth or strength) by rigorously punishing the guilty to prevent it from growing further, I should make up my mind to leave this place to go and remedy matters myself." In the codicil of Charles V's will, which he added a few days before his death, he enjoined his son to seek out and punish without mercy or pity, all the heretics in his dominions.

century. "It is an injustice to put him on the rack, which yields only a forced avowal, and often leads an innocent man to declare himself guilty. There is no law, divine or human, that can justify such a practice (*quam rem nec divina lex nec humana prorsus admittit*). (*P.L.*, CIX, col. 1010.) The harshness of barbarous customs led medieval legislators to employ severe punishments and methods that were at times nothing less than brutal." As the Protestant historian Lea declares, these "were the ordinary expedients by which the criminal jurists sought to deter crime by frightful examples which would make a profound impression on a not over-sensitive population." (*Inquisition of the Middle Ages*, I, p. 235.) It would not be just to maintain that the popes took the initiative in these severe measures. "The papacy," says Luchaire, "was the last to take up the pursuit of heresy. The popular masses, royal authority, and the local clergy preceded the papacy in this matter. The popes only followed suit and, as it were, under pressure from violent urging." (Luchaire, *Innocent III et la croisade des Albigeois*, p. 37.)

[11] Ranke, I, p. 162.

Philip II ruthlessly excuted his father's orders. In accord with Pope Paul IV, who had issued a brief directing confessors "to refuse absolution to those who would not denounce all who were inculcated in heresy, even their relations," Philip ordained (September 7th, 1558) "that all those who bought, sold, or read forbidden books, such as the Holy Scriptures in the vulgar tongue, should be condemned to be burned alive."

"Arrests were made in the most remote provinces of the peninsula," says Baudrillard. "It was in this great harvest of 1557 that the principal leaders of the Protestant movement were taken, especially at Valladolid and at Logrono. After the arrests and the trials came the penalties. Five important *autos da fé* took place—at Valladolid on May 22nd, 1559; at Seville on September 24th, 1559; at Valladolid, October 8th, 1559; at Toledo, February 25th, 1560; and at Seville, December 22nd, 1560. The first of these lugubrious solemnities took place on May 22nd, 1559, in the presence of the Regent Joan, of her nephew Don Carlos, of a considerable number of nobles and ladies, and of an immense crowd of people. The celebrated theologian Melchior Cano had been chosen to preach the sermon. The Regent and the heir to the crown, Don Carlos, took a vow to uphold the Inquisition everywhere and at all times. The reading of the sentences, the degradation of the condemned ecclesiastics, and other formalities to be gone through lasted from six o'clock in the morning until two in the afternoon. Nobody showed the least sign of fatigue, and the Regent did not retire until all was finished. The condemned, escorted by guards and followed by the clergy, confraternities, and schools, then went towards the *quemadero,* which was either a pile or a block. Fourteen were to be burnt. The first called was Agostino Cazalla, who was reconciled to the Church and exhorted his companions to abjure their errors. The Inquisitors rewarded him by ordering that he should be strangled before being thrown into the flames. His brother Francesco, a priest, refused to retract, and was burnt. A third brother, Pedro, was strangled in exchange for some useful information. The same favor was accorded to several others of the condemned who retracted, especially to several women, amongst them being Beatrix de Vibero. The bachelor Herrezuelo showed an unconquerable obstinacy.

"On September 24th, at the *auto da fé of* Seville, twenty-two persons were burnt. One woman, Maria Bohorques, continued to the very end her protestations of faith in the Lutheran doctrines. The priest Juan Gonzales and his two young sisters marched to the scaffold singing psalms, an incident which made a great impression on the people.

"The *auto da fé* held at Valladolid on October 8th, 1559, was honored by the presence of Philip II, who had been recalled to Spain by the progress of heresy. Princes, ambassadors, and the nobles of Spain accompanied him.

"There were other *autos da fé* in several towns: Protestants were burnt until the end of the century, but after 1570 Protestantism in Spain may be considered as at an end.

"Such scenes," concludes Baudrillard, "make one shudder: yet we cannot but acknowledge with Joseph de Maistre that the religious strifes of the seventeenth century caused less blood to flow in Spain than elsewhere. Compare the number of victims of the Spanish Inquisition with those of the religious wars in France and Germany, or even with the number condemned under Henry VIII, Edward VI, and Elizabeth, and mark the difference." [12]

The Index of Forbidden Books

The Church was always concerned in the condemnation of heretical books. From the earliest Christian times, she had them cast into the flames. At the end of the fifth century, Pope

---

[12] Baudrillart, *The Catholic Church, the Renaissance, and Protestantism*, p. 197.

Gelasius I drew up a list of the books which, according to his own expression, "Christians should avoid." [13] In the fifteenth century, after the invention of printing, it was needful, not only to take account of bad writings already published, but to provide that no work of such nature be published in the future: Alexander VI drew up a famous constitution,[14] which Leo X extended to the whole Church.

It appears that the first general Index of forbidden books was printed at Venice in 1543.[15] The Council of Trent in its eighteenth session (February 26, 1562) instituted a commission of eighteen fathers who were to compile a catalogue of forbidden books and in particular—this constituted an important innovation—to prepare general rules regarding them. The work of this commission was sent to Pope Pius IV at the twenty-fifth and last session, and was published by the Sovereign Pontiff in 1564. Seven years later, Pius V instituted a congregation whose duty it should be to watch over the observance of the rules of the Index. These regulations remained in force until the constitution *Officiorum* of Leo XIII, who (January 22nd, 1897) abrogated them and gave them a new form to obviate the difficulties which modern opinion accused them of creating.[16]

---

[13] *Decret. Grat.*, cap. "*Sancta,*" dist. 15, cap. 3.

[14] Constitution "*Inter multiplices*" (June 1st, 1501), in Raynaldi, 1501, no. 36.

[15] Périès, *L'Index*, p. 24.

[16] *Ibid.*, p. 32. "To my mind," wrote Francisque Sarcey, "one of the silliest commonplaces of freethought oratory is to cry out against the Congregation of the Index and its condemnations. Here is a commission of men holding a collection of beliefs and entrusted with their protection. To those who share the same faith they say: 'Take care! the ideas in this book are dangerous; keep away from them.' What could be more in harmony with sound reason and good sense?" (*Le Gaulois*, October 25th, 1869.)

CHAPTER IV

The Catholic Reformation and the Secular Clergy

THE acts of authority exercised by Catholic rulers and the repression undertaken by the Roman Inquisition and the Index were merely the indispensable prelude to a more positive and effective work of reform which would extend to the secular clergy, the religious Orders, and the laity, and would carry Catholic truth to the extremities of the earth.

The best reform, moreover, could only remain a dead letter unless it were incarnated in some men who would spread it by their personal zeal and would make it loved by their holiness. The latter half of the sixteenth century saw several such men appear; the greatest of them, placed by Providence close to the Holy See, was Cardinal Charles Borromeo.

St. Charles Borromeo

A great man always sums up a more or less latent tradition. To keep ever before him the lessons and precious example of a saintly life, St. Charles Borromeo had placed in his humble room the portrait of a holy bishop whom God called to Himself at the very hour when the Council of Trent opened. It was Matteo Giberti, who was born at Palermo in 1495 and died as bishop of Verona in 1543, after passing many years at the court of Leo X and Clement VII. Wherever he appeared, Giberti left a renown for lofty wisdom, eminent knowledge, and consummate holiness. He established in his palace a press for the publication of the works of the Greek Fathers, endowed his diocese with a large number of charitable institutions, and reëstablished ecclesiastical discipline among his clergy. One of his disciples tried to show by example how a true bishop ought to live; [1] the fathers of Trent always had in view the bishop of Verona in their reform projects, and the decrees of the Council adopted most of his institutions for the universal Church.

St. Charles Borromeo always considered himself the continuator of the work of the humble and saintly Bishop Giberti of Verona. But, in the range of his reformatory activity, he surpassed him. It is said of the great Archbishop of Milan that he was, "with the necessary difference of the times, the Hildebrand of the sixteenth century." [2] Without a doubt, there was no one who undertook and accomplished, as did he, the reformation of the clergy and laity, as intended by the Council of Trent.

When, at the beginning of 1560, the newly elected Pope, Pius IV, appointed his nephew, Charles Borromeo, then scarcely twenty-two years old, in quick succession protonotary apostolic, referendary of the papal signature, cardinal-deacon of the title of St. Vitus, and archbishop of Milan, many a one in Rome and elsewhere, as we saw above, loudly denounced this as a prodigious example of nepotism.[3] Was the world to see a repetition of the grave scandals that had occurred from Sixtus IV to Alexander VI? The new Cardinal's attitude promptly dissipated any such fear. As an accomplished man of the world, Charles knew how to conform to the exigencies of his situation in the polite and literary society of a city that passed for the most scholarly of the period.[4] But he was austere in his conduct, deaf to adulation, superior to worldly seductions, of which his family and the Pope himself one day became the accomplices,[5] and in the end he dominated all by the ascendency of his wisdom and holiness.

---

[1] Petrus Franciscus Zinus, *Boni pastoris exemplum ac specimen singulare, ex Matthaeo Giberto episcopo expressum atque propositum,* written in 1566 and found in Gibertus, *Opera,* p. 252.

[2] Brugère, p. 803.

[3] "In a spirit of piety some have tried to excuse Pius IV's nepotism by explaining his favors to his nephew on the score of a foresight of the services which the latter would render to the Church. But this explanation can scarcely be admitted, when we see the Pope later on urge his nephew to marry. (Giussano, *Vita de San Carlo,* ch. 5.) Providence deserves all the glory, the merit belongs to St. Charles." (Brugère, p. 803.)

All of Pius IV's great undertakings may be regarded as inspired by the saintly Archbishop of Milan. The reopening of the Council of Trent in 1560 and its happy issue in 1563 were largely the work of St. Charles. Once the Council was terminated, the Archbishop of Milan became a member of the commission established to interpret and to assure the observance of its decrees. The labors of the commission that drew up the Roman Catechism were under his direction.[6] He had a part, though less active, in publishing the Breviary in 1568 and the Missal in 1570.[7] For the solid training of the secular clergy he founded the Congregation of the Oblates. He held six provincial councils and eleven diocesan synods, in which, despite the often violent opposition of the governor of Milan, the chapter of St. Mary's, and the Order of the Humiliati, he methodically and perseveringly proceeded to apply all the decrees of the Council of Trent. We see him personally visiting the whole territory under his episcopal jurisdiction, going to the Swiss portion of his diocese to raise the spirit of the Catholic cantons and to encourage their confederation.

---

[4] See *Noctes Vaticanae seu sermones habiti in academia,* in St. Charles's *Opera.*

[5] Members of his family, including Pope Pius IV, having urged him, after his elder brother's death in 1562, to return to the world and get married, the young Cardinal cut short their urging by having himself secretly ordained to the priesthood. He wrote to his uncle: "Most Holy Father, do not chide me; I have chosen as a bride one whom I have loved long since, and whom I desired to possess ever since I knew her."

[6] The Roman Catechism was finished in 1564 and published two years later by St. Pius V. On the development of catechetical teaching, of which the Council of Trent was the starting-point, see Hézard, *Histoire des catéchismes,* pp. 182 sqq. and 248 sqq.

[7] Bäumer, *Histoire du bréviaire,* II, pp. 145, 160 sqq., 220, 228 sqq.

At Milan, during the pestilence of 1576, he cared for the pest-stricken, consoled them, helping them in every way even at the risk of his life. After the scourge ceased, he established numerous charitable works to relieve the miseries that followed from it. His writings, all prompted by practical and actual needs, form a veritable pastoral theology based on experience. It is true that the great Archbishop, whose pale features and strong profile betokened the austerity of his character, had none of the gentle grace of St. Francis de Sales; but of all the virtues he required of others, he himself gave the heroic example. The history of the Church does not furnish a more complete type of the man of action.

St. Charles and the Institution of Seminaries

In the supremely important work of the institution of seminaries, the organizing genius of St. Charles is revealed in all its energy and far-sightedness.

"It was at one of its last sessions that the Council passed its celebrated decree on diocesan seminaries. If this word 'seminary' or 'nursery' of the clergy was new, the thing itself was ancient. In adopting this measure, the fathers of Trent were returning to the ancient discipline of episcopal schools which formerly had borne such salutary fruit. No decision could have been more timely, for we today find it hard to imagine what was then the deplorable state of clerical education. Monastic schools, which had supplanted the episcopal schools, had in turn experienced decay. The colleges or boarding-schools founded near the universities of the big cities also degenerated. These clerical houses scarcely differed from the colleges or boarding-houses where the young laymen studied law or medicine. Besides, the best of these institutions, by reason of their location near the universities, suffered the grave defect of being inaccessible to the mass of future parish clergy. In fact, most of the young men destined for the parish ministry were trained haphazard in parish houses. Ordinarily they passed their youth in country rectories; their bringing-up was generally very crude, their instruction still more defective. Vocations were decided by the whim of parents and benefactors, according to the suggestions of interest and ambition; Holy Orders were received amidst worldly distraction, without serious preparation. All these disorders had engendered a state of ignorance and corruption which the best testimony describes with grief and which we cannot loyally dispute.

"The Council had all these evils before its eyes when it drew up its wise and salutary decree. It well knew that the reform of the clergy would not be affected by aged priests, but only by the younger clergy; it was not unaware that this youth, like the youth of the laity, is easily fascinated by the pleasures of the world, unless from its tender years it is carefully trained in piety and religion, and it was with such paternal and episcopal thoughts that the Council fixed the rules to govern the foundation of seminaries. These rules are very simple. Each cathedral church must found a seminary, where it will keep a sufficient number of clerics for the needs of the diocese. The seminary will accept only students at least twelve years old, born in legitimate wedlock, knowing how to read and write, and possessing character and inclinations that offer serious signs of a sacerdotal vocation. The students are to be recruited especially among the children of the poor. They are at once to receive tonsure and wear the clerical garb. They shall be trained in a practical manner in ecclesiastical virtues and sciences, and for this purpose be divided into a suitable number of classes. Worthy and capable superiors are to be placed over these houses. The bishop shall watch over the discipline, morals, and studies in his seminary and in the discharge of this duty shall be assisted by two canons, whom he is to choose from among the eldest and most serious.

"To help meet the considerable expenses of these establishments, the bishops are authorized to levy a contribution on all the benefices of the diocese, without any religious Order being exempt, except the Mendicants and the Knights of St. John. The bishops may also join benefices to their seminary.

"For the fixation of these contributions and for the annual auditing of the seminary accounts, the bishop shall be assisted by a commission of two canons and two pastors of the episcopal city. The bishop will appoint one of the canons and one of the pastors; the chapter and the pastors of the city will designate the other two.

"Poor dioceses may maintain a seminary in common; dioceses of large extent may have several seminaries.

"If a bishop neglects to found a diocesan seminary, his archbishop is to reprove him; if it be an archbishop who is guilty of this neglect, the provincial council will oblige him to obey.

"Such are the dispositions of this celebrated decree. They are both clear and broad. The Council did not wish to establish a course of clerical pedagogy; it left the solution of a great number of secondary questions to the prudence of the prelates who would have to regulate them in accordance with the infinitely variable circumstances of time, place, and persons; nothing could have been wiser." [8]

If we compare the decree of the Council of Trent with what Giussano [9] relates of the three seminaries established by St. Charles at Milan, "we shall see," says Thomassin, "how well this saint carried out the intentions of the Council, and even surpassed them." [10]

This same biographer says: "St. Charles saw that the assistance he needed was threefold. First, were needed good men to sustain the burden of the management; secondly, a number of fresh priests to fill the vacant parishes; thirdly, there was need of some means whereby the clergy might supply their lack of learning and be encouraged in the practice of priestly virtues, in order to labor more fruitfully in the vineyard. It was his special aim to supply these pressing needs and he directed his plans accordingly. He took especial care that their spiritual father should be a man experienced in the direction of souls, and in the guidance of youth to the punctual practice of daily mental prayer and examination of conscience, together with the frequentation of the Sacraments and the mortification of self. St. Charles provided also that the students should be trained in the true way of preaching the Word of God. To this end the clerics were accustomed to preach in turn during meals in the refectory. The first care of St. Charles on the admission of a new candidate was that the edifice of his spiritual life should rest on a solid foundation. He directed that the neophyte should be kept apart from the other students for some days of retirement and meditation under the guidance of his confessor; and that the old Adam might be entirely put off, a general confession was made of the past life. These spiritual exercises were renewed every year, at the beginning of each course of studies, and likewise before the candidates were admitted to the priesthood. These wise provisions were attended with great advantage." [11]

---

[8] Letourneau, *La mission de Jean Jacques Olier et la fondation des grands séminaires,* pp. 2–4.

[9] Giussano was an oblate of St. Ambrose and secretary and companion of St. Charles.

[10] Thomassin, *Ancienne et nouvelle discipline,* part 2, bk. 1, ch. 102.

It need scarcely be said that, to carry out his plan, the saintly Archbishop had to overcome an army of opponents. "He was obliged," says Letourneau, "to battle against routine, the passions and privileges of numerous canons, pastors, abbots, beneficiaries of every kind. Better than any one else he knew that clerical feudalism, with its claims and exemptions, would cause a mighty opposition. In this matter, as in all undertakings of moral reform, he plunged into the strife with heroic courage and he succeeded in attracting to these houses a great number of young clerics. He endeavored to have all his clerics enter these holy institutions. But that complete triumph was reserved to his successors." [12]

---

[11] Giussano, *Life of St. Charles Borromeo,* I, pp. 105, 109.

Like attempts were made in England, France, and Portugal. The disturbed condition of Germany prevented the bishops there from carrying out any measures in favor of clerical education. That is why Gergory XIII, as we saw above, instituted, on broader and more solid foundations, the German College founded at Rome by St. Ignatius for the German clergy. The first attempt to organize seminaries in England, made by Cardinal Pole in 1556, did not bear lasting fruit. In France the results of certain generous efforts seemed at first happier and more secure. The Cardinal of Lorraine, archbishop of Rheims, in 1567 founded a seminary in his episcopal city with regulations that wisely provided for all that concerned piety, study, and discipline. In consequence of resolutions adopted at the States of Blois and the assembly of Melun in 1577 and 1579, several seminaries were founded at Rouen, Bordeaux, Aix, Toulouse, etc. But neither these establishments nor the seminary that the Jesuits opened at Avignon were able to continue very long, either for lack of a competent personnel or because the practice of gathering humanists and theologians under one roof injured the good order of these various houses or because the privileges and exemptions, which in France were enjoyed by too many canons, beneficiaries, doctors, lords, and lay patrons, paralysed the bishops' action. The zeal of Bourdoise and the foundation of the Congregations of the Oratory, of St. Lazare, and of St. Sulpice, in later years permitted the resumption of the work of St. Charles Borromeo, so unfortunately interrupted.

Along with the holy Archbishop of Milan, we should mention two of his intimate friends who labored at the same work of religious reform by applying the decrees of the Council of Trent: they were the venerable Bartholomew a Martyribus and St. Philip Neri. The former, bishop of Braga, founded the first seminary in Portugal, held an important provincial synod in 1566 and, to increase the zeal of his priests, published his *Stimulus Pastorum.* At Rome St. Philip Neri, so strict with himself and so gentle with others, "who advised rather than commanded, conversed rather than taught," gathered a group of priests who, like himself, were consumed with the love of God and of souls. This was the origin of the Congregation of the Oratory, of which we shall presently have occasion to speak.

---

[12] Letourneau, p. 16.

Pope St. Pius V

In all ranks of the hierarchy were to be found holy priests who gave an edifying example of Christian and sacerdotal life—the only effective source of genuine reform. But the Catholic reform movement could not acquire conquering strength until all these individual efforts were at length coordinated and directed by the hand of a pontiff who was himself a saint. As we said above, St. Charles Borromeo notably contributed to bring about the election of Pius V, in 1566. The external history of the Church owes a place of honor to this great Pope. We see him revive the courage of the Grand Master Lavalette, powerfully help in the defense of Malta, the bulwark of Christendom, dominate the wavering Emperor Maximilian, urge firmness on Charles IX and righteousness on Catherine de' Medici, affront the powerful Queen Elizabeth, moderate Philip II, facilitate the conversion of the New World, protect the savages from the cruelty of their masters, discover the secret plots of the Moors, by advice, exhortation, and prayer sustain the Christian army which finally triumphed at Lepanto, discover and condemn the germs of a nascent heresy in the errors of Baius, crush the wicked without violence, and foil the trickery of politicians without recourse to dissimulation.[13]

But the internal history of the Church ought especially to honor this holy Pope. In that same papal palace which Leo X had made the theatre of his worldly pleasures and Alexander VI of his scandals, Pope St. Pius V rose every night to pray to God. He no longer would have the carnival amusements held in the vicinity of St. Peter's, on ground watered with the blood of martyrs. In temporal and spiritual difficulties he had recourse to the Blessed Virgin Mary, whom he venerated with a filial devotion. Desiring to have all Christians invoke her, he confirmed (September 18th, 1569) all the indulgences granted by his predecessors to the Confraternity of the Holy Rosary. He visited the hospitals and gave an example of the care to be shown the sick, entered the prisons and offered divine consolations to the condemned even to the foot of the scaffold. He blessed the continual martyrdom which he suffered from gallstones. His meals were of monastic plainness, and he sanctified them by spiritual reading, often chosen from the letters in which St. Bernard recalls to Pope Eugenius the duties of the sovereign pontificate. Beneath his papal robes he wore a shirt of Dominican serge.

Yet neither his weak health nor the prayers that occupied part of his nights, nor the spiritual and corporal works of mercy which he lavished on the poor, turned him from the duties of his office. To honor and promote the study of theology, he proclaimed St. Thomas a doctor of the Church and in 1570 had published the collected works of the Angel of the Schools, which until then were scattered and often disfigured. He loved to consult saints, such as Charles Borromeo, Philip Neri, and Francis Borgia. So convinced was he that only holiness would regenerate the world, that one of his greatest joys was to see the Carthusian Laurent Surius publish in six volumes a collection of *Lives of the Saints,* to vindicate them from the accusations which the Protestants brought against them.[14] "Beloved son," the Pope wrote to him, "we praise you for a work that we have always desired and that is most useful to repel the lies which the heretics unceasingly spread about the lives of the saints."

---

[13] Falloux, II, p. 161 and *passim*.

---

[14] We must add that not every part of the work corresponded with the author's intention. Father Schütz, S.J., in his critical commentary, *De scriptis et scriptoribus, s.v.* "Surius," says: "*Optandum fuerat ut has vitas, quales apud primaevos scriptores repererat, relinqueret.*" But a century later the project was more scientifically and successfully undertaken by the Jesuits in Holland and led to the celebrated *Acta Sanctorum* of the Bollandists.

CHAPTER V

The Catholic Reformation and the Regular Clergy

IN THE Middle Ages the great religious Orders were abundant and apparently inexhaustible sources of holiness. It was in the cloister that Pius V developed those virtues of which he gave so shining an example to the world. Not a few of these spiritual founts, however, were dried up; others gave forth only muddy and corrupt water. Entire monasteries of the Augustinian Order had passed over to Protestantism.[1] Attempts had been made at reform as early as the end of the Western Schism, but they encountered the greatest difficulties. Beginning with Martin V, nearly all the popes were concerned with the improvement of the religious Orders. But, says Pastor, "the results of the monastic reform varied greatly. . . . As a rule it was the richest cloisters and abbeys which had fallen furthest from their original spirit and which were most strongly opposed to any attempt at reform.[2] Wealth . . . tempted the nobles, who saw in the Church only a means of provision for their sons, and regarded religious houses as made to be appropriated for their own ends. . . . Rich abbeys served practically as 'hospitals for the nobles,' in which those were placed who were unfit for the world. Even the lame and blind were placed in them without any regard for a religious vocation . . . Thus did these religious houses decline more and more from their fervor . . . In fact, contemporaries complain that cloisters and consecrated places became mere pleasure resorts . . . All this was equally the case in the houses of religious women."[3]

---

[1] "The Saxon province of Luther's own Order, the Augustinians, had so degenerated that in 1521 it broke away as a whole and, with the exception of a few members, followed the new religion." (Pastor, VII, p. 304.)

[2] See the numerous examples adduced by Janssen-Pastor, I, pp. 725–732.

Under Leo X great efforts were again made to renew the religious life. At Rome the Oratory of Divine Love was formed; but the sacking of the city by imperial forces in 1527 obliged the new religious to scatter. In 1538 a commission of cardinals, appointed by Paul III, proposed the suppression of all monasteries, or at least a provisional suspension of recruiting, by forbidding them to receive any novices. Once the old personnel should disappear, an attempt would be made to train a new generation in the spirit of the primitive rule. Happily Paul III was not persuaded to follow this desperate advice. The first ravages of Protestant heresy awoke fresh zeal in the hearts of true religious. From 1528, the date of the Franciscan reform of the Capuchins, to 1600, the date of the Benedictine reform of Saint-Vanne, not only did a great number of the old Orders strive to return to their primitive fervor, but new Orders were founded, the better to meet the needs of the times: such were the Theatines, the Somaschi, the Barnabites, the Oratorians, and that Order which was to become the most effective instrument of Catholic restoration—the Society of Jesus.

In 1528 Matthieu Bassi, a Franciscan friar of the Monte Falco monastery, obtained from Pope Clement VII, for himself and for those who wished to follow him, permission to live and preach apart, with certain distinctive marks, such as the long beard and the pointed cowl. The new preachers' ardent zeal and their unstinted devotedness in all public calamities soon brought them universal esteem. The sad defection of their vicar general, Bernardino Ochino, who turned Protestant in 1542, seemed to deal them a mortal blow; but the institute, momentarily under suspicion at Rome, recovered the lost ground by its humility, obedience, and zeal. The Council of Trent authorized it to practice absolute poverty. The Order of Capuchins—such was the name given it—then continued to increase. In the seventeenth century it counted 34,000 members, among whom were several men of note, such as the famous Father Joseph so closely associated with Richelieu.

---

[3] Pastor, VII, p. 304.

In 1562 St. Teresa reformed the Carmelite convent of Avila, then, with the coöperation of St. John of the Cross, extended her reform to thirty-two convents, of which seventeen were of women and fifteen of men.

Eleven years later, Venerable Jean de la Barrière, abbot of the Cistercian monastery of Feuillant near Toulouse, tried to bring his monks back to a more austere rule of life. Sixtus V approved his reform in 1586. This was the origin of the so-called Feuillants, soon followed by the foundation of the Feuillantines (1590).

The reform of the Trinitarians, begun at Saint-Michel near Pontoise in 1578, was continued in France at the abbey of Cerfroy in 1580 and carried out in Spain (1594) by the foundation of the discalced Trinitarians. In 1596 the Dominican Michaelis, to counteract the laxity of some houses of his Order, founded the Occitaine congregation at Toulouse; and in 1594 St. Peter Fourier reformed the Canons Regular by founding the congregations of Notre Dame and Notre Sauveur. At about the same time, under the impulse of St. Pius V and Gregory XIII, the Premonstratensians and the Camaldolese returned to their ancient observance and Didier de Latour, prior of Saint-Vanne abbey in Lorraine, reëstablished the primitive rule of St. Benedict in his monastery. From this reform was born the celebrated Congregation of Saint-Vanne, which gave to the Church and science Dom Calmet and Dom Cellier. Later on the Congregation of Saint-Maur, an offspring of the same movement, produced Ruinart, Martène, d'Achery, Montfaucon, and Mabillon.[4]

---

[4] For details of these various reforms, see Hélyot, *Histoire des ordres monastiques*. Badiche cast this book into dictionary form, with notes and additions. It constitutes volumes 20–24 of Migne's *Encyclopédie théologique*.

The Carmelites

Among all the reforms is one which, by its extent and influence, by the holiness and genius of her who promoted and effected it, deserves special mention: it is the reform of Carmel by St. Teresa.

Of all the religious Orders, none was more justly proud of its origin and glorious traditions than the Order of Carmel. The tenderest devotion to the Virgin Mary was joined with practices of most austere penance. But the pious solitaries did not escape the laxity brought about almost everywhere by the Western Schism and the ruin of medieval institutions. In 1431 their general, Jean de Fasy, obtained from Pope Eugene IV a Bull of "mitigation," restricting their fasts and abstinences and tempering the rigor of their perpetual solitude. The most fervent members grieved and ceased not to long for the life of deep recollection, quiet contemplation, and ardent prayer which had been that of their pioneers. Of this number was Blessed John Soreth, who, as general of the Order, obtained from Pope Nicholas V (1442), by the Bull *"Cum multa,"* the privilege of admitting religious women to follow the rule of the Carmelites. But after his death the Carmelite nuns, subject to the government of the provincials of the Order, lost the principles of their first institutor and, for the most part, showed themselves no stricter than the fathers and brothers.

Such was the condition of affairs when, in 1560, the voice of God reached Teresa [5] of Alumada, a nun in the convent of the Incarnation at Avila, and manifested to her the divine will to see a reformed monastery of Carmel founded through her care under the patronage of St. Joseph. "If religious Orders have lost their primitive fervor," said the divine Master, "they still render me great services. What would the world become if there were no religious? . . . Go, then, daughter, find your confessor; tell him the command I have just given you, and bear him word from Me not to oppose it." [6] Shortly afterwards He added: "Daughter, you are going to understand what the founders of religious Orders have had to suffer: you will endure persecutions greater than you can imagine; but be not disturbed." [7]

---

[5] "It has long been recognized that the name *Teresa*, thoroughly Spanish, should be written as the saint herself wrote it and as it is now always written in Spain." (Polit, bishop of Cuenca, in the preface to *Œuvres complètes de sainte Térèse*, p. xiii.) The spelling *Theresa* is owing to a purely imaginary Greek etymology.

Formidable obstacles did, in fact, arise before the humble virgin as soon as she uttered the first word of reform. The opposition came from the Sisters in the convent, public opinion, and the authorities of her country. "The convent of the Incarnation," says one of St. Teresa's biographers, "not yet a half century old, had never known any but the mitigated rule; the ancient traditions of the Order it knew only as memories, the glory of which it retained without bearing their weight." [8] Moreover, the Spaniard of those days, proud of his eight centuries of combat against the infidel and of the battles fought by his armies against Protestant heresy, and no less proud of the greatness of his monarchy, "on which the sun never set," did not feel this need of reform which was agitating other nations.

Before facing the great trials incident to her mission, the holy nun had to undergo no less painful trials in the work of her personal sanctification.

---

[6] *Histoire de sainte Thérèse* according to the Bollandists, I, p. 232. This life of Saint Teresa, called, "the Carmelite of Caen," is one of the most esteemed. In 1908 Henri Joly also published a life of St. Teresa. In the same year Father Jaime Pons, S.J., brought out a new edition of Ribera's *Vida de Sancta Teresa de Jesus,* with critical notes, introduction, and appendices. The volume begins with a study by Father Louis Martin, S.J., on *Sainte Térèse de Jésus, docteur mystique.*

[7] *Histoire de sainte Thérèse* according to the Bollandists, I, p. 244.

[8] *Ibid.,* p. 237.

St. Teresa

Teresa was born of noble parents at Avila, on March 28th, 1515. From her tenderest years her soul was fretted by the anguish of things eternal. Her early longings were to set off on the road of the Moors, so as to win "the life that has no end" by martyrdom, or to build a little hermitage where she might prepare for eternity. The remorse that she experienced from some thoughts of childish vanity and some worldly imaginations aroused by the reading of chivalrous novels, enkindled in her soul the fire of divine love. Yielding to an irresistible attraction, she entered the Carmelite Order (November 2nd, 1533). God permitted the distress of separation from her family to wound her loving and delicate heart. "When I set out from my father's house," she says, "I experienced so excessive a grief that I believe the hour of my death cannot have in it anything more cruelly painful. I seemed to feel my very bones parting from one another . . . Had God not come to my assistance, all my considerations would not have been enough to make me go on." [9] But frequent visits to the parlor hindered the ascent of her soul to God.[10] Terrible illness, brought on by excessive penances,[11] grievous periods of spiritual dryness during which her courage all but failed, tried and purified her soul, uprooted or paralyzed whatever might retard her flight towards perfection. "Henceforth," said our Lord to her, "I no longer wish that you converse with man." From that moment, even in the midst of men, her soul conversed only with God, who favored her with a more elevated mystical union, with visions and ecstasies.[12] The report of the ravages caused by Protestant heresy served but to arouse her apostolic spirit. "It grieved me bitterly," she says, "and I cried to God . . . I felt that I would have laid down a thousand lives to save one of the many souls perishing there . . . All I cared for then, as I do now, was that, as the enemies of God are so many and His friends so few, these latter at least might be good ones." [13] The whole inspiration of her life and of her reform movement may be found in these lines: "One perfect soul is of more worth than a multitude of ordinary souls." [14] She also said: "I think we should act as people do when, in time of war the enemy has overrun the country and the king finds himself hard pressed. He retires into a strongly fortified town, from whence he sometimes makes a sortie. The small company with him in the citadel, being picked men, are better than a large army of cowardly soldiers." [15]

---

[9] *Œuvres complètes de sainte Térèse* (edited by Polit), I, p. 66.

[10] *Vie écrite par elle-même,* ch. 7.

[11] Certain rationalists have regarded these illnesses as hysterical attacks, which would explain the saint's revelations. On this question, see De Smedt, *Les révélations de sainte Thérèse,* in the *Revue des questions historiques,* 1884, vol. XXXV, p. 533, and Hahn, *Les phénomènes hystériques et les révélations de sainte Thérèse* in the same *Revue,* 1883, p. 183.

At first glance it would appear that nothing could be more austere, we might almost say more rigid, than St. Teresa's plan when (August 27th, 1562) she founded the first convent of discalced Carmelites at Avila under the patronage of St. Joseph. Poverty was to be absolute. The members of the community were to be limited to thirteen: "Experience has taught me," she said, "what a house is where a large number of women are gathered; God keep us from such!" There should be no lay sisters: thus the nuns would be obliged in turn to look after the household duties. Each house was to be as free from episcopal jurisdiction as possible. "I am persuaded," she wrote to Father Gratian in 1576, "that no cure can be found for our religious so long as there is not some one of the family to direct them."

---

[12] Some philosophers have offered a psychological explanation of St. Teresa's mystical phenomena, not only as being *in* the subject affected by them, but also, as of imaginings, certain internal movements of sentiment: as it happens that in a dream, anxiety, for instance, provokes images that are calculated to account for the feeling. St. Teresa sought union with God through different degrees of prayer—quietude, union, and ecstasy. These degrees progressively abolished personal consciousness and interiorly realized, for a very short time, the personal consciousness of the divine presence." (Delacroix in the *Bulletin de la Société Française de Philosophie,* January 1906.) But "such conclusions are due to the fact of studying mystical phenomena, not only as being *in* the subject affected by them, but also as being *of* the subject alone. In this method we recognize a bias under color of scientific reserve. Moreover, it is not correct to say that St. Teresa *sought* to rise to the state of quietude, etc. If there is one fact certain in the case of all mystics, it is that they are aware of undergoing an influence without being at all able, of themselves, to attain it." (Maurice Blondel, *Vie,* pp. 16–21.) This is just what St. Teresa repeatedly says (ch. 5).

[13] *The Way of Perfection,* p. 5.

[14] See the report for 1561–1562, *Lettres,* III, p. 377; *The Way of Perfection;* and the first part of the *Foundations.*

[15] *The Way of Perfection,* p. 16.

But in the holy reformer, zeal was accompanied by practical good sense and a never failing spirit of prudence. Although her first reform plan remained the ideal toward which she constantly tended, yet her remarkable perception of actual possibilities and the obedience due her legitimate superiors led her to postpone or modify it according to circumstances. As experience taught her that a community of thirteen persons might become insufficient for the choral exercises in consequence of sickness among them, she raised the maximum figure to twenty-one. She likewise recognized that the absence of all revenue, in principle well suited to impart a lively impulse to the spirit of poverty, was not strictly needful and might involve real embarrassments. Teresa also revised her idea on the subject of lay sisters and established them because she perceived "that too much bodily labor stifles the spirit." Lastly, according to times and places, she regulated the question of the dependence of the convents on the ordinaries, experience having shown her the serious difficulties there were in placing her convents under the jurisdiction of mitigated Carmelites.

Yet it is noteworthy that, in seeking to tighten, so to speak, the bonds of the material life, St. Teresa especially aspired to free the souls of her reformed religious. "She repeats in many places that the religious are not slaves. Nor would she tolerate that anyone, whether sister, mistress, prior, confessor, or visitor, should impose on them anything outside the rule. Outside the rule, it is a matter of each one's conscience." [16] "She desired," says Ribera, "that her daughters have full liberty, both in the matter of hearing sermons and in that of particular spiritual direction, to treat with those who were most suited to their souls." And she writes: "For the love of our Lord, I beg the superior to maintain this holy liberty, and to get permanent leave from the bishop or provincial for the nuns to have, besides their ordinary confessors, learned priests to whom they may all speak and open their souls." [17]

After reforming the Carmelite nuns, St. Teresa wanted to labor at a reform of the Carmelite monks. As a helper in this undertaking she had St. John of the Cross. He was born in obscurity and poverty near Avila in 1542, and at the age of twenty-one was admitted to the Carmelite Order. Father John longed to join the Carthusians, so as to lead a more recollected life, when, one day, after a short interview with Mother Teresa in the convent parlor at Avila, the latter was enlightened by God and declared: "Have patience and give up your idea of joining the Carthusians, for we will prepare in our own Order a reform that will satisfy you." This was in 1567: St. John was barely twenty-five years old. Thenceforth we witness the extraordinary sight of this monk, already a priest, being trained in the monastic life by a woman and then, along with her, undertaking to reform the monasteries of his Order. Repulses there were. Persecuted by his unreformed fellow-monks, condemned as a rebel and deserter, imprisoned, calumniated, John of the Cross bore it all patiently. For his motto he had taken the words: "To suffer and to be despised for Jesus

---

[16] Joly, *Sainte Thérèse,* p. 105.

[17] *The Way of Perfection,* p. 35.

Christ." When St. Teresa died (October 4th, 1582),[18] fifteen monasteries of Carmelite monks had already adopted a reform like that of the Carmelite nuns.

New Religious Orders

It was not enough to reform the old Orders. The religious life is, by its inspiration, a direct institution of Christ, by its organization, the work of the vivifying Spirit who animates the Church in the various phases of her earthly existence. New needs create new forms of apostolic life; they sprang up in great numbers toward the middle of the sixteenth century.

In 1524, at the height of the Italian Renaissance and in the midst of the Protestant revolt, at the very time when, in the brilliant Rome of Clement VII, Michelangelo was beginning his great architectural works and when in Germany, upset by Luther, the terrible peasant war was kindling, four Italian priests, under the auspices of the Sovereign Pontiff, founded the first of these new Orders, the Theatines. Therein we may justly recognize the most characteristic attempt of a Christian renaissance and a Catholic reformation.

A young nobleman, Gaetano di Tiene, born in 1480, familiar with the whole literary, juridical, philosophical, and theological culture of the period, went to Rome about 1508, there purchased an appointment as apostolic secretary, received prelatial honors, took part in the humanist movement, and became a friend of Cardinal Sadoleto, the celebrated literary light, just at the time when Sadoleto and certain other humanists, attracted by Christian charity no less than charmed by ancient art, were planning to found an association for the realization of their common aspirations. In 1516 they put their project into execution and founded the Society of Divine Love (*del Divino Amore*), a little gathering of sixty choice spirits that met in a tiny church in Trastevere. Gaetano soon became its soul, although they decided that no one should hold first place.

---

[18] This date is made memorable by the Gregorian reform of the calendar. The ten dates following October 4th were suppressed in the calendar so that the day following St. Teresa's death became the 15th of October. This explains why the Church fixed St. Teresa's feast on that date.

The Society of Divine Love was not long in spreading through Italy.[19] In fact, it corresponded to a tendency of the Italian Renaissance which, if we are to believe its learned historian, by mingling the teaching of Plato with the mysticism of the Middle Ages, upheld the doctrine "that the visible world was created by God in love." [20] But that was only the first stage, so to speak, in Gaetano's undertaking. After some years devoted to works of charity and in the sweet intimacy of Christian friendships, the young prelate, in union with two friends —the devout lawyer Bonifacio da Colle and the zealous bishop of Chieti, Giovanni Pietro Caraffa—planned a more profound reform. Their desire was to found a society of priests which, without adopting the rules of the old monastic institutions, would have for its aim the training of a clergy more perfect in purity, knowledge, and abnegation, and which would thus become the best means of a general reform. "This timid, precise traditionalist," says a recent biographer of St. Cajetan, "had a vision of a pure, virile, intellectual clergy, free in a free state." [21] The idea was acceptable to Clement VII and to the best prelates of his entourage.

---

[19] Father Tacchi Venturi, making use of documents discovered at the University of Genoa, proves that a Brotherhood of Holy Love was founded in that city in 1497. The Brotherhood at Rome would, then, be only an imitation of the one at Genoa. (Venturi, *Storia della Compania di Gesù in Italia,* I, p. 407.) Father Brucker (in *Etudes,* October 5th, 1909, p. 25, and January 5th, 1910, p. 98) thinks it can be traced farther back; the *Dévote compagnie secrète de l'Oratoire de Saint-Jérôme,* founded at Vicenza in 1494, had the same statutes that we find later in the Roman association and the Genoese Brotherhood.

[20] Burckhardt, *The Civilization of the Period of the Renaissance in Italy,* II, p. 382. "To love is to know," said Trithemius. Sadoleto declares that "love is the first and chief cause of our salvation."

[21] Maulde la Clavière, *Saint Cajetan,* p. 76.

By a Brief of June 24th, 1524, the Pope authorized the formation of the new institute. This Brief, says the same author, "if only by reason of its exquisite Latinity, may be considered one of the charters of the Christian Renaissance; it admirably blends the ideas of the beauty of life and of material disinterestedness. It is full of Cajetan's thought, ripened, weighed, and concentrated. The applicants, it says in effect, have expressed to the Holy Father their desire to serve God with the most perfect tranquillity of soul (*cum majori animi quiete*); to this end, they desire to make vows of poverty, chastity, and obedience, to live together without any special costume, under the direct jurisdiction of the Holy See. This the Brief authorizes them to do, as regular clergy, with a very broad and practical constitution. They are to have a superior, a 'provost,' elected annually, and in no case to hold office for more than three years. They are themselves to frame their internal constitution. They may admit to their order, after one year's probation, any priest whatsoever, and appoint any priest to receive his profession. They will enjoy the spiritual privileges of the canons of the Lateran. The Brief entrusts to them in addition a special mission, which well reflects the dominant preoccupations of the time: that of drawing up a scheme for the reform of the Breviary and the liturgy, without any limit to their power beyond the fundamental prescriptions of the apostolic canons. A special Brief gave Caraffa the dispensation necessary to his retention of the title and rank of bishop." [22]

The clerics distributed their patrimony to their relatives and to the poor by duly registered donations and retained only a small fund to help defray the first expenses of installing the new society. The title of bishop of Chieti (in Latin, *Theatinus*), which Caraffa kept, gave the new religious the name of Theatines. They soon spread over Italy and into Spain, Germany, and Poland. At the beginning of the twentieth century, this Order counted only about a hundred members in ten houses. But in its early days it rendered most eminent service to the Catholic Reformation.

---

[22] *Ibid.*, p. 88. Giovanni Pietro Caraffa was elected pope in 1555 and took the name of Paul IV.

The foundation of the Regular Clerics of St. Paul, commonly called Barnabites, from a church of St. Barnabas that was granted them in Milan, closely followed the institution of the Theatines. The three founders—St. Antony Mary Zaccaria, Bartholomew Ferrari, and Jacob Morigia—assigned it as its special aim "to regenerate and spread the love of divine worship and a truly Christian life by means of frequent preaching and the faithful administration of the sacraments." [23] The new religious bound themselves not to solicit either office or dignity. Their first organization took place in 1530, just when German Protestantism was elaborating the Augsburg Confession. They were canonically erected as an Order of Regular Clerics by Clement VII (1533) on the morrow of England's rupture with the Church, and confirmed by Paul III (1535) at the time when Calvin's *Institutio* appeared. By their missions and catechisms and by their enlightened direction of souls, these new religious powerfully helped the Church repair the breaches made by Protestantism.

The Regular Clerics of St. Mayeul, or the Somaschi,[24] were founded by St. Jerome Emiliani at almost the same time as the Barnabites. At first their sole aim was to care for orphans, the sick, and the poor. But their sphere of activity gradually widened. They opened numerous colleges, among which the chief was the Clementine College, intended for the education of boys belonging to noble families. The establishment of this Order was one of the great joys of Clement VII's pontificate. Paul III granted them (1540) canonical institution, which was renewed by Pius IV (1563) and St. Pius V (1568).

---

[23] *Constitutiones cleri regularis S. Pauli,* ch. 1.

[24] This name came to them from "Somasca," a city situated between Milan and Bergamo, where St. Jerome Emiliani drew up their rule.

These first three religious societies began in Italy. Catholic Spain, which under Charles V and Philip II so often claimed the honor of defending the cause of Catholic unity, gave to the Church the fourth and fifth of the congregations founded in that century. In 1534 a Spaniard, Ignatius Loyola, founded at Paris the Society of Jesus, which was soon to spread its works of teaching, science, and apostolate throughout the world. The Order of the Brothers of St. John of God, founded at Granada about 1540, had for its sole purpose the service of the sick. But the absolute devotedness of its members, who soon spread over all Europe, was in the eyes of the people a powerful argument for Catholic truth. St. Pius V raised the congregation to the rank of a religious Order in 1572.

Religious Orders in Italy

Under the protecting influence of the popes, the fertile soil of Italy ceased not to produce works of peaceful reform and apostolic zeal. After St. Cajetan and the Theatines, St. Antony Zaccaria and the Barnabites, St. Jerome Emiliani and the Somaschi, the restoration movement undertaken by the Council of Trent called forth in Italy St. Charles Borromeo and the Oblates, St. Philip Neri and the Oratorians, St. Camillus de Lellis and the Camillians, St. Joseph Calasanctius and the Pious Workers, St. Angela de Merici and the Ursulines.

We have already had occasion to mention St. Charles' foundations and the beneficent influence of St. Philip Neri. The Congregation of the Oratory,[25] springing from a group of priests and clerics whom St. Philip gathered about him for spiritual exercises and mutual edification,[26] was one of the most original creations of the period. "This institute," says the learned Oratorian, Father Augustine Theiner, "was founded on charity and the spirit of the first Christians"; and St. Francis de Sales called the Oratorian manner of living "an angelic life (*vita angelica*)."

---

[25] So called by St. Philip to indicate that its members, in the work of their personal reform, should rely principally on prayer.

[26] Incidents of sacred history were also set forth, with musical accompaniment. Hence the name "Oratorio," given to these musical compositions.

Its members live in community, but their food is at their own expense; they have a common table, toward which they contribute a monthly sum. From the society the members receive absolutely nothing but lodging. They are bound by no vows, are free at any time to quit the institute and take with them whatever fortune they have brought in. Notwithstanding this extraordinary liberty, it is rare to see an Oratorian leave the congregation. The society's form of government is republican. The superior, though first in honor, in other matters is on an equality with all his brethren; he has to perform all the functions of his ministry, as preacher, confessor, etc., following the order of seniority; when he reaches eighty years of age, he is not exempt from serving at table, a service performd by the fathers and not, as in other Orders, by lay brothers. The superior is assisted by four advisers, called deputies, who with him direct the inner affairs of the society.

No public act can be decided except by a majority vote of the assembled congregation. In fact, the legislative power resides in the congregation, which may call on the superior for an accounting, may depose him and restore him, if it judge useful, without the approval of any other ecclesiastical authority. The bishop is the immediate superior of the congregation, but may not order its members to do anything outside the province of the institute, of which he is the guardian. The various houses of the Oratory are independent of one another and have no superior general.[27] At St. Philip's death, the Roman Oratory chose as superior the scholarly Baronius, author of the *An-*

---

[27] Augustin Theiner in Wetzer and Welte's *Kirchenlexikon* (art. "*Philipp Neri*").

nales Ecclesiastici, one of the greatest glories of the Oratory. The congregation, formed in 1564, was canonically approved in 1583 by Gregory XIII and spread rapidly in Germany, England, Austria, and even to Mexico and Ceylon.

The society of the Camillians, founded for the care of the sick, was approved by Sixtus V in 1586 and raised to the rank of a religious Order by Gregory XIV in 1591.

At this same time Caesar de Bus in the Comtat Venaissin (now in France) and St. Joseph Calasanctius at Rome were engaged in undertakings for the training and teaching of youth.

Caesar de Bus's life is a strange one and well reflects the agitation of those troublous times. He was born of an ancient and pious family (February 2nd, 1544) at Cavaillon in the Comtat Venaissin. At a mature age he joined the Confraternity of Black Penitents, served in the royal army against the Huguenots, in the intervals between wars occupied himself with painting and poetry, went to Paris for his health, lost his faith there, and became the most worldly of courtiers. After the death of his father and his brother, in the quiet life which he led in the country and in reading the lives of the saints, he found again the belief of his youth. Thereupon he engaged in works of mercy with the same ardor that he had shown in fighting the Protestants, in cultivating the fine arts, and in frequenting worldly company at the capital. Lastly, the reading of the Catechism of Trent opened his eyes to his true vocation. He would devote himself to the education of youth. Deprived of sight at the age of forty-nine, he supported his infirmity with wonderful patience, continued to instruct the children and the uneducated, and at his death was reputed a saint. The Society of Secular Clerics of Christian Doctrine, or Doctrinaires, founded by him in 1592, was approved by Clement VIII in 1597.[28]

---

[28] Cf. Beauvais, *Histoire de la vie du P. César de Bus.*

No less dramatic, but in a different way, was the life of St. Joseph Calasanctius. He was born in a city in the kingdom of Aragon, of a wealthy noble family. His vocation showed itself at an early age. While still very young, he used to gather little children about him and teach them their prayers and the mysteries of the faith. In 1592 he went to Rome, for a while joined St. Camillus de Lellis in caring for the pest victims, but his attraction always drew him to the children of the poor. He felt himself called by God to establish, under the Blessed Virgin's protection, a congregation, called the Congregation of Pious Schools, dedicated to the work of teaching poor children reading, writing, arithmetic, and bookkeeping. The new society, founded in 1597, rapidly passed from Italy to Bohemia, Germany, and Hungary. To keep it in its pristine fervor, its holy founder suffered untold tribulations. When more than eighty years old, he was insulted, calumniated, and persecuted by members of his own congregation, deposed from his office of superior general, obliged to submit to the yoke of his chief persecutor, and died in disgrace at the age of ninety-two, after predicting the rise and increase of his Order, at that time almost reduced to nothing.

At the side of these new Orders, devoted to the teaching of poor children, there existed in Italy, from the middle of the century, a congregation of women consecrated to the education of girls: this was the institute of the Ursulines,[29] founded in 1535 by St. Angela de Merici and approved by Pope Paul III in 1544. The rule prescribed neither a habit nor life in common under the same roof. The young ladies continued to live at home or with friends, generally wore a black dress and veil. The daily recitation of the Office of the Blessed Virgin, of the seven penitential psalms, and of a prayer composed by the founder, daily hearing of Mass, communion on feast days, the practice of the evangelical counsels, and a monthly meeting under the presidency of the father superior: such were the primitive observances of the institute. Before leaving this world, the holy founder, in her will, recommended to future superiors to be guided, in the government of the society, only by the love of God and zeal for the salvation of souls, to cherish a deep esteem for each of their spiritual daughters, to be mild after our Savior's example, and to guide their spiritual family, not by violence and severity, but by love and kindness. The faithful observance of these precepts favored the influence and expansion of the new institute, which, at the death of St. Charles Borromeo, its most devoted protector, counted 18 houses and 600 members.

---

[29] So called because the foundress placed them under the patronage of St. Ursula.

CHAPTER VI

The Jesuits

THOUGH at bottom the spirit of these new congregations was the same as that which inspired the great Orders of the early Christian centuries and of the Middle Ages, yet it is impossible not to observe notable differences. A monk of St. Basil, St. Augustine, St. Benedict, St. Francis, or St. Dominic differs in many respects from a regular cleric of the sixteenth century. In the new institutes less time is given to choral office, manual labor, and the contemplative life, but a larger place is assigned to works of the apostolate, teaching and helping the poor. There is more poetry in the old Orders, while in the new there is more practical activity. When the bourgeois and the scholar were taking a place beside the old feudal lord in civil society, the Oratorian and the Jesuit appeared at the side of the sons of St. Benedict and St. Francis of Assisi.[1]

The Jesuit seems best to characterize the development of the religious life at the close of the Renaissance. There is some exaggeration in the saying that "the Church was Benedictine in the Middle Ages and became Jesuit after the Renaissance," [2] yet it is true that the son of St. Ignatius is the type of the religious of modern times.

The Society of Jesus received its special character from its founder and the providential circumstances of its foundation.

---

[1] It is scarcely necessary to say that the Franciscan and the Benedictine also take their place in this scientific and literary movement.

[2] "Since the time of the Council of Trent the work of the Jesuits has been inseparable from the progress of the Church. They have been the most complete, intense, and concentrated expression of the spirit of Catholicism." (Gabriel Monod, *La place de la Société de Jésus dans l'histoire de la Réforme,* in the *Revue politique et littéraire,* October 9th, 1909; cf. Boehmer-Monod, *Les Jésuites,* p. xviii.)

St. Ignatius of Loyola

Ignatius of Loyola, was born in 1491 [3] of a noble family in Guipuscoa. He was a page at the court of King Ferdinand of Aragon, then captain in the army of Charles V. With heroic valor he defended the city of Pampeluna against the French in 1521 and received two grievous wounds. During his convalescence he read, among other books, the *Flores sanctorum* and the Life of Christ by Ludolph the Carthusian. Thereupon he felt within him a desire to accomplish for God's glory other deeds of valor than those which his youth had dreamed of for his own glory. He hung up his sword and dagger in the sanctuary of Montserrat, led a life of penance and charitable devotion to the sick, retired to a cavern near Manresa, and there spent his time in exercises of piety which made a new man of him. At this period he began to make notes of his reflections, prayers, and various spiritual experiences; these notes grew into the famous *Spiritual Exercises*. To lead souls to sanctify themselves in the way he had followed and, with a chosen band, to form a little society of brethren devoted to the evangelization of the infidel Mussulmans, was his whole ambition. He conceives his future society as a military company marching to the conquest of souls under the standard of Christ the King as an army marches under the banner of an earthly monarch.[4] This becomes the spirit of the Society of Jesus: providential circumstances, enlarging Ignatius' views, pointed out its definitive mission.

The new convert, during his studies at the Universities of Alcala,[5] Salamanca,[6] and Paris, won six devoted companions to his project: Peter Faber, Francis Xavier, Alphonse Salmeron, James Lainez, Simon Rodriguez, and Nicholas Bobadilla. At the church of Montmartre in Paris (August 15th, 1534) all of them together took the vow of chastity and poverty and agreed to care for sick Christians at Jerusalem and to labor for the conversion of the Turks, by placing themselves at the disposal of the pope.

---

[3] This is the date proposed by Astrain, after a scholarly discussion, in his *Historia de la Compañía de Jesús en la Asistencia de España,* I, p. 3.

[4] See the meditation on the Two Standards, in the *Spiritual Exercises.*

[5] It was during his stay at Alcala that his ardent zeal and the exaggerations of two women whose consciences he was directing led to his being twice denounced to the Inquisition and being imprisoned. (Cf. Fouqueray, *Histoire de la Compagnie de Jésus en France,* I, p. 6.)

[6] At Salamanca Ignatius was subjected to new prosecutions and another imprison-

The idea of enlarging the field of action of this little band seems to have come to Ignatius at the time he met Pietro Caraffa, one of the founders of the Theatines, the future Paul IV. The oldest chroniclers say explicitly that the Saint was never willing to report what took place between himself and Caraffa, although letting it be understood that there were incidents of some importance.[7] It has been suggested as a reasonable hypothesis that "the Theatines called his attention to the abuses which defiled the Roman Church, as well as to the moral degeneracy of the West, and invited him to a field of action as wide as it was fruitful." [8] Not long after, encountering insurmountable obstacles that prevented him and his companions from going to the Holy Land, Ignatius decided, in accord with the last part of the vow at Montmartre, to place himself and his little group at the disposal of the Holy Father.

His first impression of the city of Rome on reaching there,

---

ment, in consequence of which he decided to quit that city and Spain. (Fouqueray, I, p. 7.)

[7] Joly, *St. Ignatius of Loyola,* p. 141.

[8] Cf. Joly, *Ibid.* Some historians have wondered whether St. Ignatius did not belong to the Order of Theatines for a while. There is a popular tradition that he did. At times St. Teresa in her correspondence used the word Theatines to designate the Jesuits. (*Lettres de sainte Thérèse,* edited by Grégoire de Saint Joseph, I, pp. 7, 154, 437; III, p. 350.) The latest biographers of St. Ignatius reject this hypothesis, as having no serious foundation. The similarity of dress and the analogous character of their activities may have confused the two societies in the minds of the people. Moreover, at that time, the word Theatine, to which a fanciful etymology had given the meaning of "man of God," was much in vogue. (See Maulde la Clavière, *op. cit.,* p. 88, and Joly, *St. Ignatius,* pp. 141, 157.)

in 1538, was well calculated to keep the holy founder in the West, attracted, as he always was, by the opportunity of accomplishing the greatest good. "Judging by appearances," he wrote, "we are laboring on land barren in good works and fertile in bad." [9] It was the very time when the reform commission, appointed by Paul III and principally composed of Pietro Caraffa, Giovanni Morone, Sadoleto, Aleander, and Contarini, had just proposed to the Pope the desperate expedient of suppressing all monasteries, or at least temporarily forbidding them to accept new members, so as to reorganize the religious life on entirely new foundations.[10] The Sovereign Pontiff declined to adopt this radical measure; but it was under the influence of these circumstances that Ignatius and Paul III considered the plan of a new Order, which would not, as most of the old monastic congregations, have a particular aim of penance or preaching, of corporal works of mercy or liturgical prayer, but would embrace in its mission all forms of the apostolate, literary and theological teaching in all its degrees, good works of all sorts, home and foreign missions, and would view the whole world as its field of action. The precise idea of the Society of Jesus was at last found. As one historian says, "it was a series of events, independent of Ignatius' will, which led him to create that vast organization of teaching, preaching, and spiritual direction, that was to hold Protestantism in check and so powerfully to collaborate with the work of the Council of Trent." [11]

By the constitution *"Regimini militantis"* (September 27th, 1540), Paul III authorized "his beloved sons Ignatius Loyola,

---

[9] Joly, p. 153. It may be that by these words St. Ignatius was alluding to the odious calumnies that were being spread at Rome against him and his companions. (Cf. Fouqueray, I, p. 69.)

[10] The work of this commission, though drawn up in 1537, was not published until the next year, just when St. Ignatius reached Rome. (Cf. Le Plat, II, p. 601.)

[11] Gabriel Monod in the *Revue politique et littéraire*, October 9th, 1909; Boehmer-Monod, *Les Jésuites*, p. xxvi.

Peter Faber, etc., to form a society, known as the Company of Jesus, and to receive therein whosoever, desirous of carrying arms for God and of serving only Jesus Christ our Lord and the Roman Pontiff, His vicar on earth, would be disposed to take the vow of perpetual chastity and to labor for the advancement of souls in the Christian life by preaching, by spiritual exercises, the hearing of people's confessions, and works of charity." [12]

St. Ignatius died on July 31st, 1556, leaving thirteen provinces, a hundred houses, and over a thousand religious. James Lainez, his successor, held the first general congregation, which approved the constitutions.[13] We cannot find a more exact idea of them than Ribadeneira's summary.[14]

The Jesuit Form of Government

"This is our system and form of government. At the head of the Society is a single general, armed with supreme power. He is chosen by the votes of the provincials, who are accompanied by two professed members that each province appoints and sends with its provincial to the general assembly.

"The general is elected for life. By virtue of his great knowledge of the members and affairs of the Society, he appoints the college rectors and superiors of the various houses, designates the provincials, visitors, and commissaries. This method is well calculated to preserve peace, modesty, and humility; for it suppresses or attenuates the passions, dissensions, jealousies, and hatreds which nearly always follow the election of superiors when the latter depend on the appreciation and good will of a great number.

---

[12] Bull *"Regimini,"* in the *Instit. Soc. J.* (Florence ed.), I, pp. 1 sqq. *Bullarium Romanum,* IV, pp. 185 sqq.

[13] It has been claimed that at this general assembly Lainez profoundly modified St. Ignatius' work, "reducing the government of the Institute to absolutism and making its fundamental law the will of the superior," almost assimilating it to those old Mussulman communities, long known in Spain, and being inspired by them. (H. Müller, *Les origines de la Compagnie de Jésus,* pp. 246–258.) There seems to be no doubt that the constitutions that were approved in 1556 contained certain changes of St. Ignatius' primitive text; but these were merely modifications of details, quite in conformity with the views of the founder and inspired by his spirit. (Cf. Joly, pp. 214 sqq.; *Études,* December 5, 1898.)

[14] A more detailed analysis of the Jesuit Constitutions will be found in Fouqueray, I, pp. 100–126.

"It is likewise the general who, either directly or through his provincials, governs the colleges. It is he who dispenses to his brethren the permissions and privileges granted by the Holy See, restricting some, moderating others, or withdrawing them. He has full power to admit members, to exclude, and to call the general assemblies, at which he presides. In short, all questions in the Society are subject to his judgment and decision.

"He is chosen with extreme care; yet, in order that he may not abuse his power, those who elect him choose, at the same time, four other Fathers from the most recommendable. These four are called his assistants and form his council. The general assembly, which represents the entire Society and which is above even the general, can be convoked by the assistants. It can depose the general and, if the case should require, can pronounce still graver sentence against him.

"This mode of government closely approaches a monarchy; but it still more resembles an aristocracy; for it avoids what is vicious in each of the two systems and takes what is best in each. That the government should be in the hands of one person is a condition of stability, provided he be moderate and prudent. Yet there is reason to fear that, puffed up by this honor, he may follow whim rather than reason, and that he may abuse his power to the loss of many, whereas it is confided to him for their salvation. Even though he might be spared this misfortune, and even though he be never so wise, yet no man can know all; consequently the general welfare requires multiplicity of counsel: each one gives to the others the advantages of what he is in a better position to know than they are. There is, then, the danger that there will be as many opinions as there are heads and that what ought to contribute to the unity of an assembly or society will be scattered and dispersed. To avoid these two dangers, our Company took from monarchy its unity, from aristocracy the council, thus moderating the two systems, the one by the other, in such wise that the general commands all and at the same time is subject to all (*praesit et subsit*). Such is the constitution, such the method of government of our Company which St. Ignatius elaborated and bequeathed to us." [15]

We can now see what constitutes the originality of the constitution of the Jesuits. Whereas St. Teresa and the other reformers of the old Orders sought to strengthen the cloister walls and to restrict the enclosure limits, St. Ignatius freed his religious from the bonds of monastic observance; on the other hand, unlike most founders of new religious Orders, (such as the founder of the Oratory), who accentuate democratic organization, the founder of the Company of Jesus endowed his congregation with an essentially monarchical and aristocratic character. The very conception of the new foundation, the complexity of the functions assigned to it, its international character, its exemption from many canonical rules, which St. Ignatius and Lainez asked as a condition of freer and more supple activity, doubtless required, as a means of harmony and unity of action, the existence of a firmer internal bond. As a Protestant historian says, "at the time when the Society of Jesus was constituted, the Church might reasonably have been alarmed at the disorder which the Protestant Reformation and the Renaissance had introduced into the religious edifice bequeathed by the past. It was to that requirement of rule and order, which then seemed the primordial need of Christian society, that the Society of Jesus responded." [16]

---

[15] "Nothing justifies the belief that the Jesuits had secret constitutions and rules in addition to the official Constitutions of the Order. The *Monita secreta,* which have been attributed to them, are a satire fabricated probably by a certain Zoborowski, a Polish Jesuit expelled from the Order, who published them at Cracow in 1614." (Gabriel Monod, *Mémoire lu à l'Académie des sciences morales et politiques,* October 16th, 1909. Cf. Bernard, *Les instructions secrètes des Jésuites; Monita secreta Societatis Jesu;* Boehmer-Monod, *op. cit.,* pp. lii–lxx; and Brou, *Les Jésuites de la légende,* ch. 9.)

Yet this new organization did not get established without difficulties. Says a Jesuit historian: "From the outset the Society had to struggle: at first over the question of its name, then because of the absence of choir prayer. The attack was sharp, although restrained by the pope. The danger increased when Paul IV introduced the practice of holding choir and reduced the general's term of office to three years. These measures were abolished by his successors. The recitation of the Office in common was reëstablished by Pius V (1572), but afterwards suppressed. Finally Gregory XVI put an end to all these vicissitudes by confirming, in the Bull *"Ecclesiae catholicae"* (June 28th, 1591), the primitive constitutions established by St. Ignatius." [17] Still graver difficulties developed in regard to the essentially international character which St. Ignatius had desired to give his work. "As the unbroken succession of Spaniards as generals of the society was considered dangerous, this continuity was interrupted, after the death of St. Francis Borgia, by the election of Everard Mercurian. The discontent of the Spaniards broke out under General Claudio Aquaviva, who was an Italian. They wanted procurators and a commissary general for their country, with authority independent of the general. Philip II backed up these claims; Sixtus V sustained the general. Lastly under Paul V, by the constitution *"Quantum religio"* (September 4th, 1606), the primitive institution prevailed." [18]

---

[16] Monod (p. 458). Monod goes on to say that "we may wonder whether, by the exclusive triumph of this idea of the Order, all freedom would not have been destroyed." We should, however, note that, according to the very rules of the Society of Jesus, the duty of obedience does not extend to the case of a superior commanding something that is contrary to the law of God (*"ubi Deo contraria praecipit homo"*). Nor should we forget that the fourth chapter of the Constitutions, "on the authority and watchfulness which the Society should exercise over its general," expressly limits his powers. (On Michelet's calumnies in this matter, see Boehmer-Monod, p. xiii.)

[17] Albers, *Manuel d'histoire ecclésiastique,* II, p. 311.

Expansion of Jesuit Activities

This primitive institution was animated by so powerful a vitality that, while encountering such assaults, it had enabled the new religious to accomplish marvels of zeal. No one has described with loftier impartiality the Apostolic labors of the first Jesuits than the Protestant historian Leopold von Ranke: "Not in Rome only, but throughout all Italy, the most extraordinary success attended their efforts; designed in the first instance for the common people, the Society of Jesus was not slow to gain acceptance from the higher classes also. It was highly favored in Parma by the Farnese; princesses submitted themselves to the Spiritual Exercises. In Venice, the Gospel of St. John was expounded by Lainez expressly for the nobility, and, in 1542, he succeeded, with the assistance of one of the Lippomano family, in laying the foundation of a Jesuit college in that city. So extraordinary a degree of influence was gained by Francesco Strada over the citizens of Montepulciano that many were induced to accompany him through the streets, when he went begging—Strada knocking at the different doors, and his companions receiving the donations. They made themselves extremely popular in Faenza, although this city had previously been much under the influence of Bernardino Ochino. They established schools there, succeeded in allaying enmities of a hundred years' standing, and in forming societies for the relief of the poor. I name these instances as examples only; suffice it to say, that they appeared everywhere, gained numerous adherents, and firmly established their ascendancy.

---

[18] *Ibid.* These internal quarrels in the Society of Jesus are related in detail by Astrain (*op. cit.,* vol. III). By the evidence of archival documents, he there shows that the intrigues were the work of a small number of malcontents, the most noted of whom was the celebrated Father Mariano, author of the *General History of Spain.*

"But as Ignatius Loyola was altogether a Spaniard, and entirely possessed by the ideas of his nation, as also he had thence received his most zealous disciples, it followed that his society, wholly Spanish in spirit, made greater progress in Spain than even in Italy. A very important conquest was gained at Barcelona in the person of Francesco Borgia, duke of Gandia. Such multitudes flocked to hear Araoz, in Valencia, that no church could contain them, and a pulpit was prepared for him in the open air. Equally successful was Francisco Villanova in Alcala, where he gained numerous adherents of high consideration, notwithstanding his low birth, weakness of health, and total want of learning. From this city and that of Salamanca, where the Jesuits commenced their establishment in a small wretched house in 1548, they afterwards extended themselves over all Spain. Nor were they less cordially received in Portugal. Of the first two Jesuits who were sent to him at his own request, the King retained one, Simon Rodriguez, near his person; the other he dispatched to the East Indies; and this latter was Francis Xavier, who gained for himself the name of an apostle and the glory of a saint. At both the peninsular courts, the Jesuits gained extraordinary popularity; that of Portugal they reformed altogether, and in the Spanish court they were almost instantly selected as confessors by the most distinguished nobles, the president of the council of Castile, and the Cardinal of Toledo." [19]

The Society extended itself over the Netherlands. In Lorraine the most decisive success attended the efforts of Faber. Eighteen young men, already masters of arts or bachelors in that university, attached themselves to his steps, offering to abandon home and country, for the purpose of following him into Portugal.[20]

---

[19] Ranke, I, p. 169.

"The instruction of youth had been hitherto left to men who, after long study of profane literature, had turned their attention to theological subjects, which they treated in a manner never very acceptable to the court of Rome, and eventually altogether reprobated by it. The Jesuits took upon themselves to expel these men from their office, and to occupy it in their stead. They began by the closest observance of a carefully considered system, dividing the schools into classes, and pursuing in these a method strictly uniform, from the earliest principles of learning to the highest degree of science. They paid close attention to moral culture, and formed their pupils to good character and correct manners. . . . They were expressly forbidden to ask or accept remuneration or reward; as were their sermons and masses, so was their instruction altogether gratuitous." [21]

Their colleges sprang up throughout Europe. In 1550 Emperor Ferdinand, realizing that the surest way to preserve pure Catholic doctrine in Germany was to provide pious and learned teachers for the young, turned to Ignatius Loyola. The next year, thirteen Jesuits, among them the scholarly Claude Lejay, founded their first college at Vienna. Five years later, we find them established at Cologne and Ingolstadt. From these three cities they spread into all the cities of Germany. In France, under favor of letters patent from Henry II (January, 1515), the Jesuits had to overcome the formidable opposition of Parliament and the University, which feared their influence. After the Conspiracy of Amboise, in 1560, Francis II planned setting them up as a bulwark against heresy. But the foes of the Society did not disarm. Of all the reasons alleged against its legal admission into France, the principal one was the number of privileges it had received from the sovereign pontiffs. In a petition addressed to Parliament the Jesuits protested "that they were asking for nothing more than the mendicant Orders, nothing, consequently, that was contrary to the Church in France and the concordats between the king and the Holy See." [22] On October 9th, 1560, positive orders, signed by the King of France, confirmed "the Bulls granted to the Company of Jesus by Popes Paul and Julius . . . in the hope that the fruit it will bring to Paris and other places of the kingdom will greatly exceed the embarrassments and difficulties cited by the opinions of the bishop of Paris and the faculty of theology. . . . As to these difficulties, moreover, should they arise, it will be easy to make provision through the bishops and prelates, who, as becomes them, have an open eye for whatever concerns the people's instruction." [23] Neither these nor other letters from Charles IX (December 23rd, 1560 and March 14th, 1561) caused a cessation of Parliament's resistance. But, with the backing of royal approval, the Jesuits founded several colleges in succession at Pamiers (1561), Tournon (1562), Mauriac (1563), Toulouse (1564),

---

[20] *Ibid.*, I, p. 165.

[21] *Ibid.*, p. 172. A German Protestant historian writes: "We hear it said that it was the Prussian school-teacher who won the victory at Sadowa and made sure the hegemony of Prussia. There is even more reason for saying that it was the Jesuit school-teacher who assured the supremacy of the old Church in many countries." (Boehmer-Monod, p. 55.)

---

[22] Letter from Father Cogordan to Father Lainez (July 16th, 1560), quoted by Fouqueray, I, p. 237. "By this renunciation of privileges," says Crétineau-Joly, "the Jesuits placed themselves in an impregnable position. Objection was made to the favors granted them by Rome. These favors they abandoned as explicitly as possible." (*Histoire de la Compagnie de Jésus,* I, p. 325.) Fouqueray, a recent historian of the Jesuits, does not admit this interpretation. "Such is not the meaning of Father Cogordan's words," he writes. "The Company could not give up privileges granted by the Holy See, as being necessary for their freedom of action. It could only agree to moderate the exercise thereof in case some of these privileges should be in opposition to the laws of the realm." (Fouqueray, I, p. 327.) The enemies of the Jesuits believed, or pretended to believe, that a veritable renunciation had been made.

[23] Quoted by Fouqueray, I, p. 239.

Avignon (1565), then at Chambery, Lyons, Bordeaux, etc. The opening of the Collège de Clermont at Paris, where Maldonatus taught, led to prolonged law-suits with the University (1565–1567). The foundation of the University of Pont-à-Mousson finally crowned their persevering efforts in the teaching of youth. [24] To the office of teacher, several of them added that of missioner. Such were Father Anger, who evangelized Toulouse, Lyons, Rheims, Metz, Bourges, and Paris, Father Possevin, who gave missions at Marseilles in the royal galleys, and Father Maldonatus, who debated with Protestant ministers at Sedan.

The labors of the French missioners were surpassed by those of the Apostle of Germany, St. Peter Canisius.[25] Educator, preacher, organizer and pillar of his Order, adviser and director of princes, champion of Catholicism in the diets of the empire, papal nuncio and publicist, in all these varied functions he had only one aim, which gave unity to his life, namely, to set up a true and salutary religious restoration as opposed to the false reformation. This it was that led both Catholics and Protestants to give his work the name of "Counter-Reformation." A large number of his brethren followed his example. They were, says Ranke, "at once diligent and visionary, worldly wise, yet full of enthusiasm; well-bred men and attractive companions; disregarding their personal interests, but laboring for the advancement of each other. We cannot wonder that they were successful. . . Such a combination has never been exhibited in the world before or since." [26]

The history of the Jesuits became inseparable from the universal history of the Church. They are henceforth seen in the first ranks, with St. Francis Xavier, in that magnificent movement which, in the sixteenth century, carried so great a number of missioners to the shores of Asia, America, and Africa, where, at the price of their sweat and blood, they tried to compensate for the cruel losses that heresy inflicted on the Church on the soil of Europe.

---

[24] Details of these foundations will be found in Fouqueray, I, pp. 363–616.

[25] Peter Canisius was born at Nimégue, May 5th, 1521, and died in the odor of sanctity, December 21st, 1597. He was beatified by Pius IX, June 24th, 1864, and canonized by Pius XI, June 21st, 1925. (See Vacant-Mangenot's *Dict. de théol. cath.*, art. "Canisius," by Le Bachelet).

[26] Ranke, I, p. 417. Cf. Macaulay, *History of England*, II, pp. 712–718, *i. e.* ch. 6.

CHAPTER VII

The Catholic Reformation in the Intellectual World

Erasmus, Rabelais, and Montaigne, both in their lives and in their works, admirably show forth that indefinable and equivocal spirit of the Renaissance, with its encyclopedic range and restless aspirations, at once skeptical and impassioned, wherein the Epicureanism and Stoicism of ancient Rome were so strangely mingled with the mysticism of the Gospel.[1] Following the Council of Trent, there appeared, in the nations that remained Catholic, three literary works of a frankly religious inspiration: Tasso's *Jerusalem Delivered* in Italy, Camoens' *Lusiades* in Portugal, and the dramatic works of Lope de Vega in Spain. All three poets have recourse to the fables of pagan mythology; all three exalt national sentiment; and thereby they truly belong to their century; but all three take their heroes from Christian history, and their poems are animated by a sincerely Catholic spirit. Tasso died invoking the Blessed Virgin; Camoens, in his misfortunes, remained steadfast to the faith of his childhood; Lope de Vega, educated by the Jesuits and honored with the friendship of the highest dignitaries of the Church, died in sacred Orders. Popularity at once crowned their works, in which they celebrate the heroism of the crusades, the conquest of the New World for Catholic civilization, and the Christian worship of honor.

---

[1] Erasmus, Montaigne, and Rabelais represent three aspects of humanism—that attempt to return to antiquity and to nature which the Middle Ages are said to have misunderstood. We have spoken above of Erasmus' learned dilettantism and of his successive attitudes to the Reformation. On the Neo-Stoicism of Montaigne, see Strowski, *Pascal et son temps,* vol. I "From Montaigne to Pascal," pp. 28–58. On the Epicureanism of Rabelais and his changing attitudes toward Protestant teaching, see Hauser, *Études sur la Réforme française,* pp. 47–52, 61.

In the fine arts a like evolution betrayed itself. Art, seeking to adapt itself to the diverse surroundings, becomes divided into national schools;[2] at the same time, under the influence of the decrees of Trent, it little by little abandons its too pagan inspiration. In 1573, Paul Veronese is cited before the Holy Office and rebuked for not following Catholic tradition closely enough in his "Last Supper";[3] but the Bologna school, founded by the Carraches, soon after produced, after Annibal Carrache's pathetic *"Ecce homo"* and his brother Augustine's appealing "Saint Jerome," the wonderful "Communion of St. Jerome" by Domenichino, Guido's charming Madonnas, and the fine religious paintings of Barbieri (Il Guercino).[4]

During the latter half of the sixteenth century it is true that architecture experienced an evolution, the worth of which is much disputed. The church of the Gesù, begun at Rome by Vignola in 1568, remains a typical example. The Jesuits, great builders at that period, adopted this as a model, and the style of those churches, by that fact, received the name of Jesuit style. It consists especially in making the façade of the structure the most richly decorated part, about which all the other members of the construction seem, according to an art critic, "to stir and set in motion in a great crescendo."[5]

Whatever may be the artistic merits of these temples, Pietro Luigi Palestrina's music on days of great solemnity gave them a new soul. The theatrical tone which church music had taken for some time past evoked the Council of Trent's protest.[6] By the investigations of numerous scholars it is shown to-day that the Plain Chant which Gregory the Great introduced in the churches was followed until the fifteenth century. In the Middle Ages there was added to the liturgical work of the great Pope a wealth of sequences, hymns, antiphons, and responses whose religious rhythm harmonized well with the architectural style of the venerable cathedrals.

---

[2] André Michel in Lavisse and Rambaud, V, p. 441.

[3] *Ibid.*, p. 416.

[4] On the Bolognese school, see Marcel Raymond, *L'école bolonaise,* in the *Revue des Deux-Mondes,* January 1st, 1910.

[5] Michel in Lavisse and Rambaud, V, p. 423.

[6] See Vigourel, *La liturgie et la vie chrétienne,* pp. 476 sqq.

Unhappily the development of polyphonic music (that is, music written for several voices together) little by little destroyed the rhythm of the Gregorian Chant, which became a body without a soul. The long vowel passages, having now lost their rhythm and being sung heavily, no longer inspired anything but weariness and disgust. They were abridged. Other means were sought of stirring the faithful. Profane polyphonic music, thanks to its incomparable resources of harmony and instrumentation, easily took the place of the Gregorian Chant, whose meaning seemed to be lost. Moreover, the simplicity of the Plain Chant and its long vowel passages no longer fitted in with the artistic taste of the period. On this point, as on others, there was felt a need of innovation. "*Abbrevietur cantus*" became the watchword, which found an echo even in the councils. But in abridging the Gregorian Chant, they denatured it. John XXII rose up against the mania of the innovators, who tried to "musicalize" the Plain Chant. Yet the taste for novelty continued and prevailed even at Rome. The new music, excellent to express and arouse the passions, substituted for genuine religious sentiment a vague sentimentality, more fitted to make dilettantes than Christians.

Pope Pius IV, wishing to meet the desires expressed by the Council of Trent, appointed a commission to decide on the following question: Is it useful to tolerate music in the churches? At the same time he rigorously applied the Church law which prescribed that only clerics should constitute the papal choir.

One effect of this measure was to deprive of his post a poor choirmaster, Giovanni Pierluigi, more commonly known as

Palestrina, from the name of his home city. Forgotten and forsaken, he withdrew to a poor hut near Monte Celio. But Palestrina was a lofty, courageous soul. In the silence of his retirement he devoted himself to his art with a perseverance and enthusiasm that inspired the finest and most original musical productions. The humble artist excelled in his ability to grasp and render the deep sense of a Scripture text. No one was more capable of giving church music a truly religious accent. Of this the papal commission finally took account.

Palestrina applied himself to the task. On one of the poor maestro's manuscripts are found these words: "Lord, enlighten me!" After two fruitless attempts, he succeeded in a period of inspiration in composing "The Mass of Pope Marcellus." Its success exceeded all hopes. An imploring "Kyrie," an humble "Agnus Dei," and a triumphant "Gloria" express the meaning of the text with astonishing truth and precision. Pius IV was charmed and declared that he thought he was listening to angelic melodies when he heard this mass. The question was thenceforth settled in favor of church music. At last a field was opened, wherein the most beautiful and varied productions could be displayed to the world's admiration without injury to the edification of the faithful.

The restoration of theological studies sustained the movement of literary and artistic reform. St. Thomas, whose writings were a guide to the Council of Trent, and whom Pius V declared a doctor of the Church in 1567, became the soul of this renaissance. It centered in Spain and Portugal. The University of Salamanca, where the Dominicans taught, was its cradle. St. Thomas' *Summa Theologica* replaced Peter Lombard's *Sentences* in the schools. Francis of Vittoria (1480-1566), to whom belongs the honor of giving us the first systematic doctrine of the right of war, was the promoter of the Thomist renaissance. Melchior Cano (1509–1560), Dominic Soto (1494–1560), and Dominic Bañez (1528–1604) followed in his footsteps and gave to scholastic teaching a purer diction and improved literary form.

In the Society of Jesus, which St. Ignatius had ordered to follow the teaching of St. Thomas, Pedro da Fonseca (1548–1597), surnamed the Aristotle of Coimbra, James Lainez (1512–1565), Gabriel Vasquez (1551–1604), Francisco Toledo (1532–1596), and Luis de Molina (1535–1601) commented on the writings of the Angelic Doctor. But in Spain none equalled Francisco Suarez (1548–1617), who was surnamed "Doctor Eximius." "In him alone," says Bossuet, "you will hear most of the moderns." [7] Suarez' influence was due to the perspicacity of his genius, the vast extent of his erudition, the persuasive clearness of his style, and the logical force of his argumentation. Without ever departing from the spirit or essential teaching of St. Thomas, he did not hesitate to enunciate original ideas on particular points. "His *Disputationes Metaphysicae* is undoubtedly one of the ablest, fullest, and clearest repertories of Scholastic metaphysics. It is no commentary, but an original treatise on Being, its categories and causes," [8] wherein, in disagreement with St. Thomas, Suarez rejects the real distinction between essence and existence, and this difference leads him to explain several theological doctrines in a manner different from that of the Thomists.[9]

Being of a naturally moderate spirit, Suarez showed himself eclectic and conciliatory in disputed questions. Between Thomism and Molinism, of which we will speak presently, he devised the system of "Congruism." His theory of faith shows a desire to give a proportionate place to the various psychological elements of the rational and moral order that constitute it. According to him, faith does not rest on the evidence of truth which is its subject, nor on the evidence of the witness who affirms that truth, but upon "the evidence of the obligation to believe it." To him it seems that such a theory safeguards better than any other the element of feeling and the element of freedom which the act of faith necessarily imports.[10]

---

[7] Bossuet, *Préface sur l'instruction pastorale donnée à Cambrai le 15 de septembre 1697,* no. 34. This passage of Bossuet is frequently but wrongly quoted as, "Suarez, in whom we hear the whole School." However great Bossuet's praise, it does not go that far.

[8] De Wulf, *History of Medieval Philosophy,* p. 494.

[9] Cf. A. Martin, *Suarez métaphysicien commentateur de saint Thomas,* in *La Science Catholique,* 1898, pp. 686 sqq., and De Wulf, p. 442.

In the realm of social morality, the great Spanish theologian had at heart the purpose of reconciling the rights of rulers with the rights of the people. "The common opinion," he wrote, "seems to be that God gives the power. Men furnish the matter, so to speak; in some way God gives the form by conferring the power; but it should be understood that the civil power, whenever found in a man, has emanated, by ordinary and legitimate right, from the people, either proximately or in a remote way; for it to be just, it cannot be had otherwise." [11]

It was a like theory that was more fully and enthusiastically held in Italy by Cardinal Robert Bellarmine, whom Ranke justly calls "the most powerful controversialist of the Catholic Church" [12] and of whom Bayle says that "there is no author who has better sustained the cause of the Church in general and of the pope in particular." [13] In the first place, Bellarmine, like Suarez, gave an example of the most eminent virtues.[14] A rich memory, a remarkable faculty of assimilation, a clearness of thought and method, making him fit to grasp any question promptly and to set it forth clearly, permitted the learned Jesuit to mingle in all the controversies of his time while neglecting none of the duties of his ministry. Not one of his pastoral, oratorical, ascetical, exegetical, or theological works but does honor to his name. Yet Bellarmine is first of all the apologist of the papal primacy. On the origin of civil power, on the indirect authority of the popes in relation to the temporal power of kings and on the right of popular resistance to tyranny, Bellarmine forcibly proclaims the theories taught by the Scholastic theologians of the Middle Ages.

---

[10] Suarez, *De fide,* disput. III, s. 7 and 8. Cf. Brugère, *De vera religione,* appendix 9; *De doctrina theologorum scholasticorum circa finem,* pp. 290 sqq.

[11] Suarez, *De legibus,* bk. 3, ch. 3. On Suarez, see Hurter, *Nomenclator litterarius,* I, pp. 138–142.

[12] Ranke, I, p. 383.

[13] Bayle, *Dictionnaire historique et critique,* III, p. 264.

[14] *"A multis vocatum in dubium est, doctiorne Suarez an sanctior."* (Hurter, I, p. 139.) As for Bellarmine, the process of his canonization, which was twice resumed under Benedict XIV, "was halted," says Hefele, "only because the Bourbon court at that time would have regarded the canonization of a Jesuit as an attack against it."

"It is certain," he writes, "that public authority comes from God, from whom alone emanate good and licit things. The Wisdom of God has so said in the Book of Proverbs: 'By me kings reign.' "[15] But, after setting down this principle, which puts an abyss between his theories and those of Jean Jacques Rousseau, Bellarmine loudly proclaims that "the public power resides *immediately* in the whole multitude, as in its subject, for, the positive right having been bestowed, there is no reason for one man ruling rather than another; and, as human society is a perfect government, it should have the power of self-preservation, hence the power to punish those who disturb the peace."[16] Bellarmine considers, moreover, that a Christian

[15] *"Certum est politicam potestatem a Deo esse, a quo non nisi res bonae ac licitae procedunt. Sapientia Dei clamat* (*Prov.* 8:15): *Per me reges regnant."* (Bellarmine, *Disputationes de controversiis fidei,* II, bk. 3, ch. 6.)

[16] *"Nota hanc potestatem esse, tanquam in subjecto, in tota multitudine; sublato jure positivo, non est major ratio cur ex multis aequalibus unus, potius quam alius, dominetur; humana societas debet esse perfecta respublica, ergo habere potestatem seipsam conservandi et proinde puniendi perturbatores pacis."* (Ibid.) King James I attributed to Bellarmine the assertion that every king is chosen by his subjects and for various reasons may be deposed by them. Bellarmine disavowed this doctrine. What the learned Jesuit maintains is merely that the titles of rulers, of whatever sort, are of purely human right, that, at least originally, the right of designating such rulers resides in the people, and that the people have the right to recover their liberty if the government degenerates into tyranny. Thus expressed, Bellarmine's opinion is undoubtedly open to dispute and, in fact, is disputed. But no one can deny that it agrees with the principles enunciated by St. Thomas Aquinas and admitted by most Scholastics. The Protestant theory granted less liberty to the people. Henry VIII set up the divine right of kings in opposition to the divine right of popes. Article 39 of the "Confession of Faith of the Churches of France" de-

people may free itself from the yoke of an infidel king who is drawing it into infidelity, in the same way that a Christian wife may free herself from the authority of an infidel husband, following the precept of the apostle and the decretals of the popes.[17]

Although the question of papal authority was ever the dominant preoccupation of the illustrious controversialist, yet, in his celebrated *Disputationes de Controversiis Christianae Fidei adversus hujus Temporis Haereticos,* Bellarmine touches on all the points of dogma or morals attacked by the Protestants. Having a thorough knowledge of the works of Luther, Melanchthon, Calvin, Beza and the Socinians, he clearly sets forth the points in dispute and solves them by the help of his remarkable Patristic erudition. Hence he is regarded as one of the first representatives of positive theology.[18]

The author of the *Controversies* had only to follow the way

---

clares that "God has established kingdoms, republics, and all other kinds of principalities and whatever pertains to the state of justice, and wishes to be acknowledged as their author. This cause has put the sword in the hands of rulers for the repression of sins." Calvin declares that the ideal of a good government is more easily attained in an aristocratic régime or in the union of aristocracy and republic. "The domination and overlordship of a single man," says Calvin, "is a form of power the least agreeable to men, but in Scripture it is especially recommended as above all others." Kings and magistrates are "the ministers and vicars of God." (Cf. Calvin, *Institutes,* bk. 4, ch. 2; Janet, *Histoire de la science politique dans ses rapports avec la morale,* II, pp. 150–155.)

[17] *"Cur non potest liberari populus fidelis a jugo regis infidelis et pertrahentis ad infidelitatem, si conjux fidelis liber est ab obligatione manendi cum conjuge infideli, quando ille non vult manere cum conjuge christiana sine injuria fidei, et aperte deduxit ex Paulo, I Cor. 7, Innocentius III, cap. Gaudemus, Extrav. De divortiis."* (Bellarmine, *De Romano pontifice,* bk. 5, ch. 7.) In a smaller writing, not found in his complete works, but of undoubted authenticity (see Sommervogel, *Bibliothèque de la Compagnie de Jésus,* I, p. 1180), entitled, *Responsio . . . pro successione Henrici Navarreni, auctore Francisco Romulo,* Bellarmine applies this principle to the kingdom of France and declares Henry of Navarre deprived of the right of succession to the crown because he was declared a heretic by Sixtus V. On Bellarmine's life and works, see Hurter, *Nomenclator litterarius,* I, p. 272; Le Bachelet in Vacant-Mangenot's *Dict. de théol.* (art. "Bellarmin"), and La Servière, *La théologie de Bellarmin.*

[18] Hurter, I, p. 272.

opened by the brilliant author of *De Locis Theologicis,* the Spaniard, Melchior Cano (1509–1560). This important work, which appeared about the middle of the century, marked a notable stage in the history of ecclesiastical studies. "The *De Locis Theologicis,*" says Mandonnet, "is a veritable manifesto of theological data. It is the result of the reform action carried on in Spain by Francis of Vittoria, whose most faithful and brilliant disciple Cano was. A return to Patristic erudition and the use of a literary tongue in theological sciences were the predominant points of view in the direction created by Vittoria and realized by Cano with remarkable masterfulness." [19] The *De Locis Theologicis,* which Melchior Cano's premature death left incomplete, is a treatise on method in theology. A great delicacy of judgment, a well-informed critical sense, and a finished literary form make Cano's work the equal of the finest productions of the Renaissance.[20]

Positive critical methods also prevailed in the exegetical studies of Estius and Maldonatus. William Estius, chancellor of the University of Douai (1542–1613), won the enthusiastic admiration of his contemporaries by the talent he displayed in his commentary on the Apostolic Epistles and his explanation of the texts which the Protestants quoted to sustain their false doctrines. Notwithstanding certain doctrinal errors, resembling those of his teacher, Baius, he received the title of "Doctor Fundatissimus" from Benedict XIV. But his renown was surpassed by that of the Jesuit Maldonatus (1534–1583). Maldonatus was born in Estremadura and taught theology at Rome. When the Society of Jesus obtained the right to open schools in Paris (1562), it called the learned professor thither. Equally well-versed in history and the Oriental languages as in philosophy and theology, Maldonatus obtained the greatest success in his public lectures on the four Gospels. Like Abélard, he drew to these classes so great a number of followers that the hall where he taught could not hold them and he was obliged to teach in the open air. Calvinist preachers followed his lectures and admired his scholarship. Says Dom Calmet: "Maldonatus possessed all those faculties that go to make a remarkable scholar." Richard has paid tribute to the solidity of his knowledge,[21] and the critics of our own day still derive great profit from studying his commentaries on the Gospels.[22]

---

[19] Mandonnet in Vacant-Mangenot, *op. cit.* (art. "Cano").

[20] Cano's opinion on matrimony, which, according to him, becomes a Sacrament only by the intervention of the priest, had enough weight to induce a large number of theologians to follow it. For a while it even became the common opinion. Cf. *De locis theologicis,* bk. 8, ch. 4.

In the renaissance of ecclesiastical studies, schools were formed and new topics discussed. One of the chief questions in dispute during the latter half of the sixteenth century was Molinism.

The Protestant heresy, by drawing attention to the difficult problem of the relation of grace to free will, gave a new impulse to the two tendencies which, ever since the predestination dispute of the fifth century, had divided Catholic theologians. Must it be admitted that God determines the human will in advance to each one of its acts by an all-powerful impulse or "premotion," which necessarily entails consent and *seems* to destroy the action of free will? Or ought it be recognized that actual grace is not efficacious by its own nature, does not necessarily obtain the act toward which it urges, that consequently human acts *seem* to be independent of God's action? In other words, to use the technical expression of theologians, granting that God gives men sufficient grace for their salvation, does this sufficient grace become efficacious by its own proper power (*ab intrinseco*), or by the consent of the human will (*ab extrinseco*)?

---

[21] Simon, *Histoire critique des principaux commentaires du Nouveau Testament.*

[22] Maldonatus' commentaries on the Gospels have been reprinted again and again. The date of the first edition is 1596. Says Reusch; "It is claimed that the editions since 1617 have been mutilated." Reusch in Goschler, *Dict. de théol.* (art. "*Maldonat*"). "*Prima editio est rara,*" says Hurter, "*et, ut ait Calmet in Bibliot., optima; cur autem haec præferatur, inquit,* (*l.c.*) *faciunt ea quae in parisiensi et lugdunensi editione edita sunt, vel mutata, vel dempta.*" (*Nomenclator litterarius,* I, p. 88.) Cf. Prat. *Maldonat et l'université de Paris au XVI^{e} siècle.*

At the Council of Trent, the attention of the fathers had been roused on this doctrinal point; but, in fidelity to their general rule in disputed matters, they avoided favoring one opinion rather than the other in drawing up their decrees.

In 1588 a Spanish Jesuit, Luis de Molina, professor of theology at the University of Evora, a man of great learning and eminent virtue, brought out at Lisbon a work entitled, *Concord of Free Will with the Gifts of Grace.* Therein he clearly taught that sufficient grace, given by God to all men, becomes efficacious only through the consent of free will and that the work of sanctification is thus the result of the simultaneous coöperation of God and man. Moreover, he said, the fulfilment of God's sovereign will, its infallible predestination, cannot, under this head, suffer any loss; God predestines a man, not by giving him a grace that He *makes* efficacious, but by giving him a grace that He *knows* to be efficacious. Molina explained how God can have certain knowledge of a fact that exists neither in the present nor in the past nor in a determined future, but simply in the conditional future: in this matter he borrowed from his teacher Fonseca the theory of the *scientia media* ("middle knowledge").

The book had a great success. This consoling solution of a redoubtable problem was ardently preached by the sons of St. Ignatius and was favorably received by a great number of the faithful.

But did not such a system contradict the formal texts of St. Augustine and even of St. Thomas Aquinas, as also the universal character of divine causality? The sons of St. Dominic, devoted champions of the Thomist tradition, declared that it did.

Just when Molina's book appeared, a holy and learned Dominican, Dominic Bañez[23] (1528–1604), was teaching at Salamanca. He was a powerful mind, a lofty and noble soul, a monk of great piety. For several years he was St. Teresa's confessor. Bañez taught out and out that nothing in man can be withdrawn from the divine causality, that God, to use the expressions by which Bossuet later summed up this doctrine, "governs our freedom and ordains our acts; that if free creatures were not comprised in this order of Providence, that would be to take from God the conduct of what is the most excellent in the universe;"[24] that in creating freedom, God reserved to Himself certain means of leading it where He pleased;"[25] that God consequently made two parts in humanity, one to show His mercy and the other to manifest His justice. Such a doctrine nowise shocked those sixteenth-century Spaniards, accustomed as they were to consider the world as a battlefield between the Cross and the Crescent, between the chosen race and the cursed race. Moreover, the logical coherence of the system, rigorously deduced from the consideration of divine causality and placed under the authority of St. Thomas, seduced many theologians.

The strife soon grew so lively between Jesuits and Dominicans that Pope Clement VIII, in 1594, summoned the matter to Rome, and, in 1597, instituted the famous Congregation *De Auxiliis*[26] to pass judgment on it. In vain did Suarez and Vasquez try to conciliate the adversaries by interposing, between Thomism and Molinism, the system of Congruism, according to which sufficient grace becomes efficacious in consequence of a conformity and adaptation of the character of the agent to the circumstances of the act. The controversy was not appeased. On November 30th, 1602, the Jesuit Gregory of

---

[23] Or Bañes, as it is sometimes spelled.

[24] Bossuet, *Traité du libre arbitre,* ch. 3; Lebel ed. XXXIV, p. 383.

[25] *Ibid.,* p. 388.

[26] *De auxiliis divinae gratiae.*

Valentia, in a debate with the Dominican Lemos, fell exhausted to the floor.[27] At length (August 28th, 1607) Pope Paul V put an end to the discussions and enjoined the rival Orders to abstain from the use of injurious epithets.

These heated debates were not without result for theology. Though the system of efficacious grace and free will remains an obscure and insoluble problem, though, after all is said and done, we must confine ourselves "to holding strongly, as it were, to the two ends of the chain, without always seeing the middle where the chain continues," [28] at least we can see springing from these debates a deeper knowledge of human nature and of the supernatural; it was in these disputes that the theologians were prepared to combat the most subtle and dangerous of the errors of the seventeenth century—Jansenism.

---

[27] Serry, *Historia congregationum de Auxiliis,* p. 301.

[28] Bossuet, *Libre arbitre,* ch. 4; Lebel ed. XXXIV, p. 410. For a more complete doctrinal exposition and for a discussion of the Thomist and Molinist arguments, see Tanqueret, *Synopsis theologiae dogmaticae specialis,* III, ch. 1, nos. 104–113, Pohle-Preuss, *Grace, Actual and Habitual,* pp. 222 ff.; Labauche, *Dogmatique spéciale: L'homme,* part 2, art. 4.

CHAPTER VIII

The Catholic Reformation and the Spiritual Life

THE spiritual life, which experienced so powerful a development during the second half of the sixteenth century, had incomparable masters. The century of Luther's pamphlets and Calvin's *Institutions* was likewise that of St. Ignatius' *Spiritual Exercises* and St. Teresa's *Way of Perfection.*

The "Spiritual Exercises"

It has been questioned to what extent the author of the *Exercises* was inspired by ascetical writings before his time, notably those of the Benedictine Dom Garcia Cisneros, printed about 1500.[1] In reality, the founder of the Society of Jesus seemed to have made use of the whole ascetical tradition of the Church; but he did so with his own temperament, with the aid of special lights communicated to him by God, and in view of a new enterprise, marvelously adapted to the needs of modern times: therein lies the novelty of the book of the *Spiritual Exercises.*[2]

Masters of the spiritual life, describing the advance of the soul towards God, distinguish two ways: the ascetical way, by which the soul, more active than passive, more conscious of its own efforts than of the divine action within it, rises to perfection by a series of exercises, the rules of which form a veritable practical science; and the mystical way, whereby God calls whom He pleases and wherein the soul, more passive than active, and conscious of God's action within it, has, as its chief duty, surrender to grace.

---

[1] Hermann Müller (pseudonym), in a work entitled *Les origines de la Compagnie de Jésus,* maintains the hypothesis that St. Ignatius borrowed not only from Cisneros, but from the rules of Mussulman religious orders. The borrowing from Cisneros seems likely. As for the analogies indicated between the *Exercises* and the rules of Mussulman religious orders, they are far from convincing. (See Müller, pp. 36–144.)

[2] In *Études* for 1897, Father Watrigant has a series of articles on the question of what St. Ignatius took from his precursors, especially from Ludolph the Carthusian. Cf. Joly, *Saint Ignace de Loyola,* pp. 37 sqq., where a summary of the discussions on this point will be found.

St. Ignatius was no stranger to the mystical state, but in the book of the *Spiritual Exercises* he meant to lay down rules of pure asceticism. Is there question of a soul passing from unbelief to religion, choosing a state of life, taking an important resolution, undertaking a renewal of Christian life? The *Exercises* utilizes all the traditional means and methods for the development of the Christian life: meditation, vocal and mental prayer, examination of conscience, mortification of the senses and employment of all our faculties—reason, feeling, memory, imagination, and will. Thus it is intended to lead that soul, by a sure and clearly marked way, to the desired goal.

First of all, a solid, enlightening, and fundamental meditation recalls to the soul that it comes from God, its first Principle, and that it should aspire to God, its last End; that henceforth all created things should be chosen in the measure in which they lead to that supreme end, and rejected in the measure in which they remove therefrom. This first conviction is considered as the preliminary and indispensable condition of the success of the *Exercises*. Without it, it would be useless to go any farther. But, once this disposition is assured, St. Ignatius, during an entire week, places the soul face to face with its sins, makes it ashamed of its own corruption, shows it the terrible punishment of sin in the fall of Lucifer and his demons, in the lamentable decadence of the human race as a consequence of Adam's sin, and in the eternal torments of the reprobate. He seeks to produce these pictures, not by oratorical means, but, according to his habit, through a realistic representation of the object by "the application of the senses."

In these meditations, the retreatant is never alone. One of the original characteristics of St. Ignatius' method is to place him who is making the exercises beside him who "gives" them. A master is there, experienced in spiritual ways, enlightened by the admirable "annotations" that precede the text of the *Exercises,* and especially by the "rules of discernment of spirits." According to the retreatant's needs, the retreat master prolongs or abridges, repeats or omits such or such a particular exercise.

Once this first stage is complete, St. Ignatius conducts his disciple to the stage of the second week, but only after sounding his heart, as he tries to sound his reason at the beginning of the exercises. Has the disciple really a generous disposition of soul (*magnum et liberalem animum*)? If so, St. Ignatius prepares him for "the election," that is, for the resolution that should crown the retreat. Before the retreatant's eyes, he evokes the image of a magnanimous king summoning his knights to conquer the Holy Land from the Mussulman. Then he shows him Christ, King of the ages, to whom belongs absolute dominion over the universe, proposing battles and conquests to men of good will. Like the magnanimous king, Jesus the Saviour does not hide the dangers of the undertaking; they are the ones that He himself met: the cross with its humiliations, poverty and its sufferings; but the stakes of the campaign are the greatest that can be imagined, since they are the salvation of souls and the glory of God.

During the last two weeks the spiritual guide passes in review before the retreatant's eyes, in a well-ordered series of contemplations, all the mysteries of our Saviour's life from the Incarnation to the Ascension.[3] He helps him to make "the election," that is, to take the resolution which is the chief object of the retreat; and this is followed by a final contemplation, intended to make the greatest love rise up in the soul. Thus, the disciple goes forth from these exercises, which began by a cold intellectual meditation, with a flame of love in his heart.

The Mysticism of St. Teresa

St. Teresa turns to souls that have already passed through the trials of asceticism described by St. Ignatius, or souls that God would raise, from the outset of their spiritual life, to the higher but a thousand times more painful conditions of mystical contemplation.[4] The Saint knew by revelations and ecstasies, the inexpressible beauty of the soul in the state of grace,[5] the indescribable ugliness of the sinful soul,[6] the great prize of eternity, the infinite power of love.[7] The soul, eternity, love—these three words indicate the whole inspiration of St. Teresa's work.

The phases of the mystical life are marked especially by states of prayer. The reformer of the Carmelites excelled in describing these states and making them understood. Nearly all other mystics—Ruysbroeck, Tauler, Blessed Angela de Foligno—suddenly transport us into contemplations and ecstasies. We are disconcerted by the often obscure and strained language. St. Teresa's language is clear, supple, alert, spiritual, and of literary perfection. She leads us step by step on the "path of perfection," pictures for us the different abodes in the "interior castle" of the soul, relates her own "foundations," and sets forth the phases of her interior life with such charm [8] that even persons unacquainted with the mystical states which she describes follow her with delight.

---

[3] A Protestant historian draws attention to the sublimity and the broad scope of these meditations. Not only is the retreatant conducted through a review of his own life, with all its faults and wretchedness, but he follows the whole drama of the world's Redemption, from the fall of the angels to the Ascension of Christ. (Böhmer, p. 33.)

[4] *Way of Perfection,* chs. 17 and 18. The Saint is careful to remark that "contemplation is a gift of God, which is not necessary for salvation nor for earning our eternal reward . . . She who is without it, yet who follows the counsels I have given, will attain great perfection." (*Ibid.,* p. 107.)

[5] *Interior Castle,* ch. 1.

[6] *Ibid.,* 1st mansion, ch. 2; 7th mansion, ch. 1; *Vie écrite par elle-même,* ch. 11.

[7] In chapter 29 of the *Vie écrite par elle-même,* St. Teresa relates the famous vision during which an angel pierced her heart with a flaming dart.

Ordinary prayer or meditation, mystical union or passive contemplation, and extraordinary union or ecstasy: these are the three stages through which St. Teresa follows the soul in its ascent towards God. Ordinary prayer, according to St. Teresa, is not merely the starting-point of this ascent: it is the indispensable exercise to which recourse must be had every time that God does not raise the soul to the mystical state. This ordinary prayer, carefully described by St. Ignatius, is made under the form either of meditation or affective prayer, according as the reason or the heart is chiefly concerned. St. Teresa mentions the former of these two forms and describes the latter, without calling it by this name, in several places in her works.[9] But she particularly studied the soul just as it enters the mystical state, properly so called. At times she calls this "the supernatural state," because, she says, we can never acquire it by ourselves, no matter what care and diligence we employ; all we can do is to dispose ourselves for it by keeping ourselves perfectly subject to God.[10]

Contemplation, which in its first degree St. Teresa also calls the prayer of quietude, and mystical union when it reaches its second degree, is outlined by the Saint in her *Life* and in the *Way of Perfection* and closely analysed in her last work, the *Interior Castle.* The starting-point of the prayer of quietude is a sweet and calm recollection,[11] soon followed by a deep peace, amidst which the soul "perceives a certain fragrance, as we may call it, as if within its inmost depths were a brazier sprinkled with sweet perfumes." [12] The soul then understands, but in a different way than it could by the medium of external senses, that it is already near God.[13] It cannot doubt God's presence within it.[14] "It is less distressed by the fear of hell, for, though more anxious than ever not to offend God, it has lost servile fear. . . Greater indifference is felt for sufferings. . . As the soul better understands the divine Majesty, it realizes more vividly its own baseness." [15]

---

[8] The best edition of her complete works is that published by the Carmelites of Paris under the direction of Mgr. Polit.

[9] *Vie par elle-même*, chs. 11, 12, 13; *Way of Perfection*, ch. 19; *Interior Castle*, 4th mansion, ch. 2.

[10] Letter to Father Alvarez, February 1576; *Way of Perfection*, chs. 19, 25, 31.

From the state of quietude, the soul led by God in the mystical ways, rises to the state of union, where, completely dead to creatures, and living only in God, it feels united to the Divinity "in so close a manner that it is like a person who faints from excess of joy and happiness." [16] Then "the spirit does not recognize itself, being as different from what it was as is the white butterfly from the caterpillar. . . The soul is desirous of praising God, and longs to sacrifice itself and die a thousand deaths for Him. . . After what it has experienced, everything on earth disgusts it . . . Its wings have grown and it can fly . . . It wearies of everything, realizing that no true rest can be found in creatures." [17]

At the same time "it feels an interior torture at seeing that God is so greatly sinned against; and this pain penetrates the very depths of its being, appearing to cut the soul into pieces and grind it to powder . . . Yet the soul feeling it, in its vehement love for God, counts these sufferings as naught and would willingly undergo greater." [18]

---

[11] *Interior Castle,* 4th mansion, ch. 3; *Way of Perfection,* ch. 28.

[12] *Interior Castle,* 4th mansion, ch. 2.

[13] *Way of Perfection,* ch. 31.

[14] *Vie écrite par elle-même,* ch. 15.

[15] *Interior Castle,* 4th mansion, ch. 3.

[16] *Sur le Cantique des cantiques,* ch. 4.

[17] *Interior Castle,* 5th mansion, ch. 2.

Then we have the moment of ecstasy, the prelude of the transforming and, so to speak, deifying union. It is an indescribable state, in which God resides in the soul, for "as He has a dwelling-place in heaven, so has He in the soul, where none but He may abide, and which may be termed a second heaven." [19] "All the three Persons here communicate themselves to the soul, speak to it, and make it understand the words of our Lord in the Gospel, that He and the Father and the Holy Ghost will come and make their abode with the soul which loves Him, and which keeps His commandments." [20] "That which we hold, as a doctrine of faith, the soul now, so to speak, understands by sight, although it beholds the Blessed Trinity neither by the bodily nor by the spiritual eyes, for this is no imaginary vision." [21] All this does not totally absorb the soul, which "is far more active than ever in all that concerns God's service, and when at leisure, enjoys this blessed companionship." [22]

God now, "by an imaginary vision of His most sacred Humanity, reveals Himself to the soul . . . full of splendor, beauty, and majesty, as He was after His Resurrection." [23] God unites Himself to the soul. "Union may be symbolized by two wax candles, the tips of which touch each other so closely that there is but one light; or again the wick, the wax, and the light become one . . . But spiritual marriage is like rain falling from heaven into a river or stream, becoming one and the same liquid, so that the river and the rain water cannot be divided; or it resembles a streamlet flowing into the ocean, which cannot afterwards be disunited from it."[24] There is only one expression fit to designate a union of this sort—spiritual marriage, which is the tomb where the mystic butterfly died and where Christ becomes the soul's life.[25] The fruits of this new life are a total forgetfulness of self, a greater desire to suffer, and the habit of considering death as a gentle delight. But the desire to suffer is tranquil because of the perfect conformity of the soul with God's pleasure and the impatience for death in order to be with Christ is changed into an ardent desire to live so as to serve Him and procure His greater glory. Thus this ascent of the soul, which appears to remove it from the external apostolate, leads it back thereto with a hundredfold greater force. For, says St. Teresa, "by its becoming one with the Almighty, by this sovereign union of spirit with spirit, the soul must gather strength, as we know the saints did, to suffer and to die . . . This must be the reason of the severe penances performed by many of the saints . . . This caused the zeal felt by our Father Elias for the honor of God, and the desires of St. Dominic and St. Francis to draw souls to praise the Almighty . . . Believe me, both Martha and Mary must entertain our Lord and keep Him as their Guest, nor must they be so inhospitable as to offer Him no food. How can Mary do this while she sits at His feet, if her sister does not help her? His food is, that in every possible way we should draw souls to Him, that they may be saved and may praise Him for ever."[26]

---

[18] *Ibid.*, pp. 109, 112.

[19] *Ibid.*, 7th mansion, ch. 1, *i. e.* p. 254.

[20] *Ibid.*, p. 257.

[21] *Ibid.*

[22] *Ibid.*, p. 258.

[23] *Ibid.*, p. 261.

---

[24] *Ibid.*, p. 264.

[25] *Ibid.*, p. 271.

[26] *Ibid.*, p. 288. St. John of the Cross, St. Teresa's colaborer in the reform of Carmel, gives another description of the soul's ascent to God, envisaging the states of the soul from a different point of view and completing the doctrine of St. Teresa. He considers four principal stages in the mystical life: (1) the *night of the senses,* which is characterized by a tendency of the soul to turn towards God alone, in the midst of spiritual dryness and with a feeling of powerlessness to meditate or converse, but with such an impression of God's presence in the soul that we can perceive the beginning of what St. Teresa calls the prayer of quietude; (2) the

This colorless summary, despite our care to use the Saint's own words so far as possible,[27] conveys but a feeble notion of those sublime pages, written by a hand that seems still trembling with the emotions of contemplation and ecstasy. No one ever spoke with such great depth and doctrinal sureness [28] of the marvels of that divine life whose existence in men's souls Protestantism boldly denied. It may not have been sufficiently

---

first period of the *night of the spirit,* marked by a state of habitual quietude and "a binding of the powers of the soul," a second purgatory, as it were, added to that of the night of the senses; (3) the second period of the *night of the spirit,* characterized by a sort of blinding contemplation of the attributes of Divinity; (4) the transforming union or spiritual marriage which exactly designates the state described by St. Teresa under the same title. St. John of the Cross describes the first three stages in *The Ascent of Mount Carmel* and *La nuit obscure,* the fourth in *La vive flamme d'amour* and *Le cantique spirituel.* He differs from St. Teresa in that he particularly sets forth the toilsome and dolorous character of the soul's ascent, while St. Teresa sets forth its bright and consoling aspect. The most original portion of his doctrine is the description of the *night of the senses,* which theretofore had not been studied with such depth and delicacy. (Cf. Poulain, *La mystique de saint Jean de la Croix* and *The Graces of Divine Prayer,* p. 200.)

[27] Briefly, the following are the different phases of the ascent of a soul which God leads by the mystical path, as they appear to St. Teresa according to her own experience. A lively feeling of God's presence produces a *mystical recollection* in the soul. The peaceful joy of that divine presence gives the soul the state of *quietude,* which contains various degrees. A strong turning of the will towards God alone, while the other powers of the soul—memory and understanding—partly keep their own activity, leads it to the state of *mystical union.* The progressive death of all its powers to things of earth and their ever increasing adherence to the thought and love of God, raise it to the *perfect union.* If this union of the powers no longer comes only from the interior, if the soul feels, as St. Teresa says, that "God is drawing it to Himself in such a way that it seems to quit the organs that it animates," it is then the state of *ravishment* or *ecstasy,* called also transport or flight of the spirit. The soul is then so seized and occupied by God that it ceases to exercise, in relation to the body to which it is united, its ordinary functions: bodily heat grows weak; the body becomes so light that it has scarcely any weight; at times a mysterious force raises it. It is in the state of ravishment that occur the phenomena known as *betrothal* and *spiritual marriage.* The ravishment of all the powers of the soul at the same time is of very brief duration. It soon leaves the soul to the ordinary gloom and wretchedness of the life of this world. But from it the soul keeps a new force, in view of deeper sufferings to be undergone and in view of a more devoted activity to be undertaken.

[28] In the Office of St. Teresa, the Church begs God to nourish the faithful with the sweetness of her heavenly doctrine, *"ut caelestis ejus doctrinae pabulo nutriamur."*

remarked how Luther's negations found their most telling refutation in the positive work of St. Ignatius and St. Teresa. According to the heresiarch's fundamental thesis, man is sanctified neither by his works nor by his personal efforts, but by the sole application of Christ's merits, who covers the stained soul, as by a cloak, without changing it interiorly. The *Spiritual Exercises,* by their marvelous effectiveness in converting souls,[29] showed what could be accomplished by man's effort, wisely disciplined under the influence of divine grace; and the writings of St. Teresa make us feel the nearness and effulgence of that interior, transforming, and divinizing action which all tradition, following St. Paul and our Saviour Himself, had affirmed. Luther maintained his doctrine by setting up a claim of individual inspiration as opposed to the judgment of the Church and the pope; Ignatius and Teresa, favored by the most reliable divine communications, on the contrary prostrate themselves at the feet of the Roman pontiff. Ignatius added, for his Order, to the three usual religious vows, that of placing itself at the absolute disposal of the pope; and Teresa, when dying in the raptures of ecstasy, could but repeat these words: "Lord, I am only a child of the Church." This is why their work was destined to be fruitful.

---

[29] St. Francis de Sales said of the *Spiritual Exercises* that "it made more conversions than it had letters."

BIBLIOGRAPHY

The following is a list of the works referred to in the footnotes:

Academie des Inscriptions: *Comptes rendus.*

Acta Sanctorum, the scholarly work of the Bollandists.

Albers: *Manuel d'histoire ecclésiastique.*

Alexander of Hales: *Summa theologica.*

Amydenus, T.: *De pietate romana,* 1625.

André, Marius: *Bienheureux Raymond Lulle,* 1909.

Anshelm, Thomas: *Chronique de Berne.*

Antoninus, St.: *Historiarum opus.*

Arago, François: *Popular Astronomy,* tr. by Admiral W. H. Smyth, 2 vols., 1858.

Archives Curieuses de l'histoire de France.

Archives de l'histoire de France.

Archiv für Literatur- und Kirchengeschichte.

Astrain, Antonio: *Historia de la Compañia de Jesús en la asistencia de Españas,* 4 vols., 1914.

Aubery, Jacques: *Histoire de l'exécution de Cabrières et de Mérindol.*

Audin, J. M. V.: *Histoire de Léon X,* 1844.

History of the Life, Writings, and Doctrines of Luther, tr. by W. B. Turnbull, 2 vols., 1854.

Augustine, St.: *Works,* ed. by Marcus Dods, 15 vols., 1885.

Ayroles, Jean Baptiste: *La vraie Jeanne d'Arc,* 5 vols., 1902.

Baguenault de Puchesse, Gustave, Comte: *Histoire du Concile de Trente.*

Balan: *Monumenta reformationis lutheranae ex tabulariis secretioribus Sanctae Sedis, 1521–1525,* 1884.

Storia d'Italia.

Balmes, James: *Protestantism and Catholicity Compared in their*

Effects on the Civilization of Europe, tr. by Hanford and Kershaw, 1851.

BALUZE, Étienne: *Miscellanea,* 4 vols., 1764.

Vitae paparum avenionensium, 2 vols., 1921.

BARLETTA, Gabriel: *Sermones,* 1511.

BASCHET, Armand: *Les archives de Venise,* 1870.

BATIFFOL, Louis: *The Century of the Renaissance,* tr. by E. F. Buckley, 1916.

BAUDRILLART, Alfred: *Quatre cents ans de concordat.*

The Catholic Church, the Renaissance, and Protestantism, tr. by Mrs. Philip Gibbs, 1908.

BÄUMER, S.: *Histoire du bréviaire,* 1905.

BAUMGARTEN: *Die Politik Leo X.*

BEAUMANOIR, Philippe de Remi, Sire de: *Coutûmes de Beauvoisis,* 2 vols., 1690.

BEAUVAIS: *Histoire de la vie du P. César de Bus,* 1645.

BELLARMINE, Robert: *De conciliis et ecclesia.*

De conciliorum utilitate.

De romano pontifice.

Disputationes de controversiis fidei.

BEMBO, Pietro: *Epistolae Leonis X.*

BENAVIDES, Antonio: *Memorias de D. Fernando IV de Castilla,* 2 vols., 1860.

BENRATH: *Luther im Kloster,* 1905.

BERNARD, St.: *On Consideration,* tr. by George Lewis, 1908.

BERNARD: *Les instructions sécrètes des Jésuites,* 1903.

BÈZE, Théodore de: *Histoire ecclésiastique des églises réformées au royaume de France,* 3 vols., 1889.

BEZOLD, Friedrich von: *Geschichte der deutschen Reformation,* 1890.

Bibliothèque de l'Ecole des Chartes.

BIEL, Gabriel: *Collectorium circa quatuor sententiarum libros.*

BLANC, Charles: *Histoire des peintres.*

BLANC, Louis: *History of the French Revolution of 1789,* 1848.

BLENNERHASSETT, Lady: *Maria Stuart,* 1909.

BODMANN: *Œuvres posthumes.*

BŒHMER-MONOD: *Les Jésuites.*

Böhm: *Handschriften des K. K. Staats-Archivs,* 1874.

Bolsec, Jérôme H.: *Histoire de la vie, mœurs, actes, doctrine, constance, et mort de Jean Calvin,* 1875.

Bossuet, Jacques Bénigne: *Defensio declarationis conventus cleri Gallicani anno 1682,* 2 vols., 1745.

Histoire de France pour le Dauphin.

History of the Variations of the Protestant Churches, 2 vols., 1836.

Instruction sur les états d'oraison.

Libre arbitre.

Préface sur l'instruction pastorale donnée à Cambrai le 15^{e} *septembre 1697.*

Bouche: *Essai sur l'histoire de Provence.*

Boudinhon: *De la validité des ordinations anglicanes,* 1895.

Étude théologique sur les ordinations anglicanes.

Bouix: *De papa.*

Boutaric, Edgar Paul: *La France sous Philippe le Bel,* 1861.

La Saint Barthélemy d'après les archives du Vatican.

Notices et extraits des manuscrits.

Boutillier: *Somme rurale.*

Boutroux, Étienne Emile: *Historical Studies in Philosophy,* tr. by Fred Rothwell, 1912.

Science and Religion in Contemporary Philosophy, tr. by Jonathan Nield, 1909.

Bouvier: *La question Michel Servet,* 1908.

Bréhier, Louis: *L'Eglise et l'Orient au Moyen Age,* 1907.

Brémond, Henri: *Sir Thomas More,* tr. by Harold Child, 1904.

Bridgett, Thomas Edward: *Life and Writings of Blessed Thomas More,* 1913.

Life of Blessed John Fisher, 1902.

Brigid, St.: *Revelations.*

Brom: *Guide aux archives du Vatican,* 1910.

Brosch: *Alexandre VI.*

Brou: *Les Jésuites de la légende.*

Broussolle, J. C.: *L'art, la réligion, et la renaissance,* 1910.

Brugère, Louis Frédéric: *De vera religione.*

Tableau de l'histoire de la littérature de l'Eglise.

Brulefer: *In libros IV sententiarum S. Bonaventurae.*

Brunetière, Ferdinand: *Discours de combat,* 2 vols., 1903.

Histoire de la littérature française, 8 vols., 1907.

Buckley, T. A.: *The Canons and Decrees of the Council of Trent,* 1851.

Bullarium Romanum.

Burchard, Johann: *Diarium sive rerum urbanarum commentarii, 1483–1506.*

Burckhardt, Jacob Christoph: *Handbuch der deutschen Archive,* 1887.

Luthers Briefwechsel.

The Civilization of the Period of the Renaissance in Italy, tr. by S. G. C. Middlemore, 2 vols., 1878.

Burnet, Gilbert: *History of the Reformation of the Church of England,* 7 vols., 1865.

Callary, F.: *L'idéalisme franciscain spirituel au XIV^e siècle,* 1910.

Calvin, John: *Institutes of the Christian Religion,* tr. by Henry Beveridge, 3 vols., 1846.

Opera, 59 vols., 1900.

Campano, Gian Antonio: *Vita Pii II.*

Capecelatro, Alfonso: *Histoire de Sainte Catherine de Sienne,* 1863.

Castil-Blaze, François: *La danse et les ballets,* 1832.

Catalogue général des manuscrits des bibliothèques publiques.

Catherine of Siena, St.: *Saint Catherine of Siena as Seen in her Letters,* tr. and edited by Vida D. Scudder, 1906.

Catherinus, Ambrosius: *De casu hominis et de peccato originali.*

Caveirac, Jean Novi de: *Apologie de Louis XIV, suivie d'une dissertation sur le Saint-Barthélemy.*

Cavendish, George: *The Life and Death of Cardinal Wolsey,* 1905.

Cayet, Palma: *Panthéon littéraire.*

Cerri: *Borgia ossia Alessandro VI,* 1858.

Chamberet, Comte de: *Vie de sainte Colette,* 1887.

Charles Borromeo, St.: *Opera,* 5 vols., 1747.

Chartier, Alain: *Le quadrilogue invectif.*

Chastenet, Bourgeois de: *Nouvelle histoire du concile de Constance.*

Chevalier, Ulysse: *L'abjuration de Jeanne d'Arc au cimetière de Saint-Ouen et l'authenticité de sa formule,* 1902.

Christophe: *Histoire de la papauté pendant le XIV*^{e} *siècle.*

Chroniques de Saint-Denis.

Clerval: *De Jodoci Clichtovei neoportuensis vita et operibus,* 1894.

Cobbett, William: *A History of the Protestant Reformation in England and Ireland,* 1905.

Cochin, Henry: *Le Bienheureux Fra Giovanni Angelico de Fiesole,* 1906.

Commines, Philippe de: *Memoires,* 2 vols., 1856.

Corio, Bernardino: *Storia di Milano,* 3 vols., 1857.

Corpus Juris Canonici.

Corpus Reformatorum, 94 vols., 1914.

Cortés, Donoso: *Lettres et discours,* 1850.

Cournot, Antoine Augustin: *Considerations sur la marche des idées dans les temps modernes,* 2 vols., 1872.

Crepin, Jean: *Acta Martyrum.*

Crétineau-Joly: *Histoire de la Compagnie de Jésus.*

Cristiani: *Luther et le lutheranisme.*

D'Achery, J. L.: *Veterum aliquot scriptorum qui in Galliae bibliothecis maxime Benedictorum latuerant spicilegium,* 13 vols., 1677.

Dalbus: *Les ordinations anglicanes,* 1894.

Daniel, Gabriel: *Histoire de France.*

Dante Alighieri: *De monarchia,* tr. by Aurelia Henry, 1904.
Divina Commedia, tr. by H. W. Longfellow.

D'Argentré, Charles du Plessis: *Collectio judiciorum de novis erroribus.*

Delaborde, H. François: *Expédition de Charles VIII en Italie,* 1888.

Delacroix: *Le mysticisme spéculatif en Allemagne.*

Delphinus: *Oratiunculae.*

Denifle, Heinrich: *Anthologie des mystiques allemands.*
Archiv für Literatur- und Kirchengeschichte des Mittelalters.
Die Universitäten des Mittelalters bis 1400, 1885.
Kritische Bemerkungen zur Gerson-Kempis Frage.

La désolation des églises, monastères, et hôpitaux en France pendant la guerre de cent ans, 3 vols., 1899.

La vie spirituelle d'après les mystiques allemands du XIV^{e} siècle, 1904.

Luther und Luthertum, 1905; tr. in part by A. Reinhardt and Raymund Volz, 1917.

Denifle and Chatelain: *Chartularium Universitatis parisiensis,* 4 vols., 1897.

Denifle and Weiss: *Luther und Luthertum in der ersten Entwickelung,* 1909.

Denzinger: *Enchiridion.*

Deslandres, Paul: *Le concile de Trente et la réforme du clergé catholique au XVI^{e} siècle.*

Desmay, Jacques: *Remarques sur la vie de Jean Calvin.*

Destombes: *Histoire de la persécution en Angleterre sous Elisabeth.*

Dialogues entre le Maheustre et le Manant, 1593.

Dictionnaire Apologétique de la Foi Catholique.

Dictionnaire de Bibliologie, 5 vols., 1860.

Dictionnaire de Théologie (Goschler).

Dictionnaire de Théologie Catholique (Vacant-Mangenot).

Dictionnaire Historique.

Dictionnaire Historique et Critique, 1820.

Didiot, Jules: *Logique surnaturelle objective.*

Digard, Faucon, and Thomas: *Les registres de Boniface VIII,* 1884.

Dionysius the Areopagite: *On the Divine Names,* tr. by C. E. Rolt, 1920.

Documents inédits sur l'histoire de France.

Döllinger, Johann Joseph Ignaz von: *La réforme et son développement intérieur,* 3 vols., 1848.

Lehrbuch der Kirchengeschichte.

The Church and the Churches, or the Papacy and the Temporal Power, tr. by W. B. MacCabe, 1862.

Dorlandi: *Chronica Carthusiana.*

Douillet: *Sainte Colette,* 1884.

Doumergue, Émile: *Jean Calvin, les hommes et les choses de son temps,* 5 vols., 1917.
Du Bellay: *Mémoires.*
Dubois, Pierre: *Gesta Dei per Francos.*
Duboulay: *Historia Universitatis parisiensis.*
Duchesne, Louis: *Liber Pontificalis.*
Dunand: *Études critiques sur l'histoire de Jeanne d'Arc,* 3 vols., 1909.
Histoire complète de Jeanne d'Arc, 3 vols., 1902.
Dupleix: *Histoire de Henri le Grand,* 1635.
Dupuy: *Histoire du différend entre Boniface VIII et Philippe le Bel,* 1655.
Mémoires, 1654.
Durand, Guillaume: *De modo celebrandi generalis concilii,* 1545.

Ehses, Stephan: *Acta concilii Tridentini,* 1904.
Encyclopédie des Sciences Religieuses.
Encyclopédie Théologique (Migne).
Erasmus, Desiderius: *Commentarius in S. Marcum.*
Epistles, 1918.
Opera, 11 vols., 1706.
Paraclesis.
The Colloquies, tr. by N. Bailey, 3 vols., 1900.
The Praise of Folly, tr. by John Wilson, 1913.

Fages: *Saint Vincent Ferrier,* 1893.
Falloux: *Vie de saint Pie V.*
Faucon: *Les artistes à la cour d'Avignon.*
Felice, Guillaume de: *History of the Protestants of France,* tr. by Philip Edward Barnes, 1853.
Feller (editor): *Biographie Universelle,* 45 vols.
Féret, Pierre: *Henri IV et l'Eglise,* 1875.
La faculté de théologie de Paris au Moyen Age, 10 vols., 1909.
Ficino, Marsilius: *De religione christiana.*
Fiorentino: *Il risorgimento filosofico del Quattrocento,* 1885.

Flammarion, Camille: *Popular Astronomy,* tr. by J. E. Gore, 1894.

Fleury: *Opuscules,* 1818.

Fleury, Claude: *Histoire ecclésiastique,* 36 vols., 1738.

Fleury, Jules François: *Histoire de la caricature sous la réforme et la ligue,* 1880.

Fontaine, Simon: *Histoire catholique de notre temps,* 1558.

Forneron, Henri: *Histoire de Philippe II,* 4 vols., 1882.

Fouqueray, Henri: *Histoire de la Compagnie de Jésus en France,* 2 vols., 1913.

Fournier, Edouard: *L'esprit dans l'histoire,* 1867.

Fraikin, J.: *Nonciatures de Clement VII,* 1906.

France, Anatole: *The Life of Joan of Arc,* tr. by Winifred Stephens, 1909.

Funck: *Gerson und Gersen.*

Funke: *Papst Benedikt XI,* 1891.

Fuzet: *Pétrarque, ses errures, ses voyages, sa vie chrétienne,* 1883.

Gachard, Louis Prosper: *Correspondance de Philippe II sur les affaires des Pays-Bas,* 4 vols., 1861.

Notice historique et descriptive des archives royales de Simancas, 1848.

Notice sur le dépôt des archives de Belgique, 1831.

Gairdner, James: *Lollardy and the Reformation in England,* 4 vols., 1913.

Garampi: *Saggi di osservazioni sul valore delle antiche monete pontificie.*

Garzend, L.: *L'inquisition et l'hérésie,* 1913.

Gasquet, Francis Aidan: *Henry VIII and the English Monasteries,* 2 vols., 1902.

Gautier, Léon: *Benoit XI; Étude sur la papauté au commencement du XIV*^{e} *siècle.*

Études et tableaux historiques.

Gee and Hardy: *Documents Illustrative of English Church History,* 1896.

Génin, François: *Lettres de Marguerite d'Angoulême,* 2 vols., 1841.

Gerson: *Opera.*

GIBERTUS: *Opera.*

GIUSSANO, John Peter: *The Life of St. Charles Borromeo.*

GONET: *Clypeus thomisticus.*

GOYAU, G.: *Vieille France, jeune Allemagne.*

GRAF: *La vie et les œuvres de Lefèvre d'Etaples.*

GRANVELLE, Antoine di Perrenot de: *Papiers d'état.*

GREAT BRITAIN: *Acts of the Privy Council.*
Calendar of State Papers.
Statutes of the Realm.

GREGOROVIUS, Ferdinand: *History of the City of Rome in the Middle Ages,* tr. by Annie Hamilton, 8 vols., 1902.

GRINGOIRE, Pierre: *Les folles entreprises.*
Œuvres complètes.

GRISAR, Hartmann: *Luther,* tr. by E. M. Lamond, 6 vols., 1917.

GUERARD, Louis: *Petite introduction aux inventaires des archives du Vatican,* 1901.

GUICCIARDINI, Lodovico: *Opere inédite,* 10 vols., 1867.
Storia d'Italia.

GUILLEMIN, Amédée: *The World of Comets,* tr. by James Glaisher, 1877.

GUIRAUD, Jean: *L'Eglise romaine et les origines de la Renaissance,* 1904.

GUIZOT, François: *The History of Civilization,* tr. by William Hazlitt, 3 vols., 1846.

HANOTAUX, Gabriel: *Histoire du Cardinal de Richelieu,* 2 vols.
Recueil des instructions.

HARNACK, Adolf: *History of Dogma,* tr. by Neil Buchanan, 7 vols., 1910.
Outlines of the History of Dogma, tr. by E. K. Mitchell, 1893.

HARTZHEIM: *Concilia Germaniae.*

HAURÉAU, Jean Barthélemy: *Bernard Delicieux et l'inquisition albigeoise,* 1877.
Notices et extraits de quelques manuscrits latins de la bibliothèque nationale, 6 vols., 1893.

HAUSER, H.: *Études sur la réforme française.*

La réforme et les classes populaires en France au XVIe siècle.
Les sources de l'histoire de France, 1909.
HAVEMANN: *Geschichte des Ausgangs des Tempelherrenordens.*
HEFELE, Carl Joseph von: *Histoire des conciles.*
The Life of Cardinal Ximenez, tr. by Canon Dalton, 1860.
HEINEMANN: *Aeneas Sylvius.*
HELYOT, Pierre: *Histoire des ordres monastiques, religieux et militaires, et des congrégations séculières,* 8 vols., 1792.
HENNES: *Erzbishof Albrecht von Mainz.*
HENRY VIII: *Defense of the Seven Sacraments,* 1908.
Letters and Papers.
HERGENRÖTHER: *Handbuch der allgemeinen Kirchengeschichte,* re-edited by J. P. Kirsch, 4 vols.
HEZARD: *Histoire des catechismes,* 1900.
Histoire littéraire de France.
Historiens de la France.
HOEFER: *Nouvelle biographie générale,* 46 vols.
HOEFLER: *Rodrigo de Borgia.*
HOESSEL, D. G. F.: *Catalogi librorum manuscriptorum qui in bibliothecis Galliae, Belgiae, Britanniae Magnae, Hispaniae, Lusitaniae asservantur,* 2 vols., 1893.
HÖFFDING, Harald: *A History of Modern Philosophy,* tr. by B. E. Meyer, 2 vols., 1920.
HOOPER, John: *Later Writings.*
HUGH OF ST. VICTOR: *De sacramentis.*
HUME, David: *The History of England,* 1865.
HURTER, Hugo: *Nomenclator Litterarius Theologiae Catholicae* 5 vols., 1899.
HUTTEN, Ulrich von: *Opera.*

IGNATIUS LOYOLA, St.: *Spiritual Exercises.*
IMBART DE LA TOUR, Pierre: *Les origines de la Réforme,* 2 vols., 1914.
Questions d'histoire sociale et religieuse, 1907.
INFESSURA, Stefano: *Diario della città di Roma,* 1890.
ISAMBERT: *De l'étude et des sources des anciennes lois françaises,* 1822.

Janet, Paul: *Histoire de la science politique dans ses rapports avec la morale,* 2 vols., 1872.
Janssen, Johannes: *History of the German People at the Close of the Middle Ages,* tr. by M. A. Mitchell and A. M. Christie, 16 vols., 1910.
  An meine Kritiker.
  Schiller als Historiker.
John of the Cross, St.: *The Ascent of Mount Carmel,* tr. by David Lewis, 1906.
Joly, Henri: *Sainte Thérèse,* 1902.
  St. Ignatius of Loyola, tr. by Mildred Partridge, 1899.
Journal d'un bourgeois de Paris.
Jovius, Paulus: *Elogia doctorum virorum,* 1571.
  Historiarum sui temporis libri XLV.
  Vita Leonis X, 1548.
Julleville, Louis Petit de: *Joan of Arc,* tr. by Hester Davenport, 1901.
Jundt, A.: *Le développement de la pensée religieuse de Luther jusqu' en 1517.*

Kalkoff, Paul: *Aleander gegen Luther,* 1908.
  Forschungen zu Luthers römischem Prozess, 1905.
Kampschulte, Franz Wilhelm: *Die Universität Erfurt in ihrem Verhältnisse zu dem Humanismus und der Reformation,* 2 vols., 1860.
Keicher, Otto: *Raymundus Lullus,* 1909.
Kerker: *Vie de Jean Fisher.*
Kervyn de lettenhove: *Les Huguenots et les Gueux,* 6 vols., 1885.
  Recherches sur la part que l'Ordre de Citeaux et le Comte de Flandre prirent à la lutte de Boniface VIII et de Philippe le Bel, 1853.
Kraus, Franz Xaver: *Kirchengeschichte.*
Kuhn, Félix: *Luther, sa vie et son œuvre,* 3 vols., 1884.

Lafenestre, Georges Edouard: *S. François d'Assise et Savonarole, inspirateurs de l'art italien,* 1911.
Laferrière, Adolphe: *Le XVI^{e} siècle et les Valois,* 1879.
  Lettres de Catherine de Médicis, 10 vols., 1909.

Laffay, E.: *Origines du protestantisme,* 1905.

Lang, Andrew: *M. Anatole France on Jeanne d'Arc,* 1909.

Lang, August: *Die Bekehrung Johannes Calvins,* 1897.

Langlois, Charles Victor: *Le règne de Philippe III le Hardi,* 1887.
Manuel de bibliographie historique, 1904.

Lanson, Achille: *Histoire de la littérature française,* 1909.

Laurent, François: *Études sur l'histoire de l'humanité.*

Lavallée, Théophile Sébastien: *Histoire des Français,* 4 vols., 1854.

Lavisse, Ernest: *Histoire de France,* 9 vols., 1911.

Lavisse and Rambaud: *Histoire générale,* 12 vols., 1901.

Lea, Henry Charles: *A History of the Inquisition of the Middle Ages,* 3 vols., 1888.

Lebauche, L.: *God and Man: Lectures on Dogmatic Theology,* 2 vols., 1917.

Lechler, Gotthard: *John Wiclif and his English Precursors,* tr. by Peter Lorimer, 2 vols., 1878.

Leclercq, H.: *Les martyrs,* 12 vols., 1913.

Le Couteulx, Charles: *Annales Ordinis Carthusiensis.*

Lefèvre d'Etaples: *Commentaire sur les Epitres de S. Paul.*

Lefranc, Abel: *La jeunesse de Calvin,* 1882.

Le Glay: *Correspondance de Maximilien I*^{e} *et de Marguerite d'Autriche.*

Lelong, Jacques: *Bibliothèque historique de la France,* 5 vols., 1778.

Leonetti: *Papa Alessandro VI,* 1880.

L'Epinois, Henri Comte de: *La Ligue et les papes,* 1836.
Le gouvernement des papes au Moyen Age.

Le Plat, Josse: *Monumentorum ad historiam Concilii Tridentini potissimum illustrandam spectantium amplissima collectio,* 7 vols., 1787.

Les martyrs de Gorcum (in the collection "Les Saints").

Lesquen and Mollat: *Mesures fiscales exercées en Bretagne par les papes d'Avignon pendant le grand schisme d'Occident,* 1903.

Lessius: *Liber de vera capessenda religione.*

Letourneau, G.: *La mission de Jean Jacques et la fondation des grands seminaires.*

Levesque and Urbain: *Correspondance de Bossuet,* 10 vols., 1916.

LEZEAU: *De la religion catholique en France.*
L'HOPITAL, Michel de: *Lettres,* 1825.
LINDNER: *Urban VI.*
LINGARD, John: *The History of England,* 11 vols., 1915.
LIZERAND, G.: *Clement V et Philippe IV,* 1910.
LOISELEUR, Jean: *Trois énigmes historiques,* 1882.
LOISY, Alfred: *Histoire du canon de l'Ancien Testament,* 1890.
LORAIN, Prosper: *Essai historique sur l'abbaye de Cluny,* 1839.
LUCHAIRE, Denis Achille: *Innocent III et la croisade des Albigeois,* 1905.
Manuel des institutions françaises au Moyen Age, 1892.
LULL, Raymond: *L'arbre de la philosophie de l'amour.*
L'art général.
Le livre des merveilles du monde.
LUTHER, Martin: *Briefe,* edited by De Wette, 6 vols.
Colloquia (Bindseil ed.), 3 vols., 1866.
Commentary on the Canticle of Canticles.
Correspondence, tr. by Preserved Smith, 2 vols., 1913.
Deutsch Theologia.
Letters, tr. by Margaret A. Currie, 1908.
Opera (Jena ed.).
Sämtliche Werke (Erlangen ed.), 67 vols., 1868.
Schriften (Walch ed.).
Table Talk, tr. by William Hazlitt, 1848.
Werke (Enders ed., being supplementary to the Erlangen ed.), 1870.
Werke, Kritische Gesamt-Ausgabe, ed. by Knaake. (This is referred to as the Weimar edition.)

MACAULAY, Thomas Babington: *History of England,* 8 vols., 1886.
MACHIAVELLI, Nicolò: *History of Florence.*
The Prince, tr. by W. K. Marriott, 1920.
Writings, tr. by C. E. Detmold, 4 vols., 1882.
MADELIN: *De conventu Bononiensi.*
MAI, Angelo: *Spicilegium Romanum,* 10 vols., 1844.
MAJUNKE, Paul: *Luthers Ende,* 1886.

MALOU, Jean: *Recherches historiques et critiques sur le véritable auteur de l'Imitation de Jésus-Christ,* 1849.

MANSI: Annotated edition of Baronius-Raynaldi: *Annales,* 38 vols., 1759.

MARGUERITE D'ANGOULÊME: *Heptameron.*

MARIANA, Juan de: *The General History of Spain,* tr. by John Stevens, 1699.

MARTÈNE, Edmond: *Veterum scriptorum et monumentorum ecclesiasticorum et dogmaticorum amplissima collectio.*

MARTIN: *De l'avenir du Protestantisme et du Catholicisme.*

MARTIN, Henri: *Histoire populaire de la France.*

MARTIN, Jules: *Gustave Vasa et la Réforme en Suède,* 1906.

MAULDE DE LA CLAVIÈRE: *Les origines de la Révolution française au commencement du XVI^e siècle,* 1899.

Saint Cajetan, tr. by G. H. Ely, 1902.

MAZZELLA, Camillo: *De vera religione et de Ecclesia Christi.*

MELANCHTHON, Philip: *Epistolae.*

Opera, 7 vols., forming part of the *Corpus Reformatorum.*

Vita Lutheri.

Mélanges de l'Ecole de Rome.

Mémoires de l'Academie des Inscriptions.

Mémoires du Clergé de France.

MERKLE, Sebastian: *Concilii Tridentini diariorum pars prima,* 1901.

MEUFFELS, Hubert: *Les martyrs de Gorcum,* 1908.

MÉZIÈRES, Alfred: *Pétrarque d'après les documents inédits,* 1868.

MICHAUD and POUJOULAT: *Nouvelle collection de mémoires.*

MICHELET, Jules: *History of France,* tr. by G. H. Smith, 2 vols., 1847.

MIGNE, Jacques Paul: *Nouvelle Encyclopédie Théologique,* 171 vols., 1866.

MIRANDOLA, Pico della: *Vie de frère Jérôme Savonarole.*

MISTRAL, Frédéric: *Nerto.*

MOEHLER, John Adam: *Symbolism,* tr. by J. B. Robertson, 1906.

MOELLER, Charles: *Introduction critique à l'histoire moderne: materiaux et littérature,* 1891.

MOLLAT, G.: *Les papes d'Avignon,* 1912.
Lettres communes de Jean XXII.
MOLMENTI: *Venice, its Individual Growth.*
MONOD, Gabriel: *Mémoire lu à l'Academie des sciences morales et politiques.*
Monumenta Conciliorum Generalium Saeculi Decimi Quinti.
Monumenta Historica Societatis Jesu.
MOSHEIM: *De beghardis et beguinabus,* 1790.
MÜLLER, Hermann: *Les origines de la Compagnie de Jésus.*
MURATORI: *Rerum italicarum scriptores,* 25 vols., 1761.

NAMÈCHE: *Guillaume le Taciturne,* 2 vols., 1850.
NEMEC: *Papst Alexander VI,* 1882.
NICHOLAS OF CUSA: *De conjecturis temporum.*
NIEM, Theodoricus de: *De schismate papistico,* 1802.
NOLHAC, Pierre de: *Pétrarque et l'Humanisme,* 1892.
NOSTREDAME, Jean de: *Les vies des plus célèbres et anciens poètes provençaux,* 1575.
Nouvelle Biographie Générale, 46 vols.

OCCAM, William: *Dialogues,* 1494.
OLLIVIER, Joseph Henry: *Le pape Alexandre VI et les Borgias,* 1870.

PALLAVICINI, Pietro Sforza: *Histoire du concile de Trente,* 4 vols., 1833.
PALMIERI: *Ad vaticani archivi romanorum pontificum regesta manductio,* 1884.
Panthéon Littéraire.
Papal Registers, Innocent III to Sixtus V, 2018 vols.
PAPENCORDT: *Cola di Rienzo und seine Zeit.*
PAQUIER, J.: *Jérôme Aléandre,* 1900.
PARIS, Alexis: *Les manuscripts français,* 7 vols., 1848.
PARISET, Georges: *L'État et les Eglises en Prusse sous Frédéric-Guillaume Ier,* 1896.

Pastor, Ludwig von: *Reunionsbestrebungen.*

History of the Popes, 1912.

Paulus, N.: *Luthers Lebensende und der Eislebener Apotheker Johann Landau,* 1896.

Pelayo, Alvarez: *De planctu ecclesiae.*

Péréfix, Hardouin de: *History of Henry IV,* tr. by Le Moine, 1903.

Pérennès (editor): *Dictionnaire de Bibliographie Catholique.*

Périès, Georges: *La faculté de droit dans l'ancien Université de Paris.*

L'Index, 1898.

Perrens, François Tommy: *Jérôme Savonarole,* 1856.

Petit-Doutaillis, Charles: *Documents nouveaux sur les mœurs populaires et le droit de vengeance dans les Pays-Bas au XVe siècle,* 1908.

Petitot, Claude Bernard: *Mémoires relatifs à l'histoire de France,* 52 vols., 1826.

Petrarch, Francesco: *De vita solitaria.*

Le rime, 3 vols., 1829.

Pfeiffer, Franz: *Deutsche Mystiker des vierzehnten Jahrhunderts,* 2 vols., 1857.

Philippson: *Die Römische Curie und die Bartholomäusnacht.*

Piccolomini, Aeneas Sylvius: *Opera.*

Pius II: *Letters,* 1909.

Platina, Bartolommeo: *The Lives of the Popes,* 1865.

Pohle-Preuss: *Grace, Actual and Habitual,* 1914.

Poulain, Augustin: *La mystique de S. Jean de la Croix.*

The Graces of Interior Prayer, tr. by Leonora L. Yorke Smith, 1912.

Potthast, August: *Regesta Pontificum Romanorum,* 2 vols., 1875.

Prat: *Histoire du Concile de Trent,* 3 vols., 1854.

Maldonat et l'Université de Paris au XVIe siècle, 1856.

Proteolus: *De vitiis, sectis omnium haereticorum.*

Ptolémée de Luques: *Histoire ecclésiastique.*

Puller: *Les ordinations anglicanes et le sacrifice de la messe,* 1896.

Puyol, Pierre: *L'auteur du livre de Imitatione Christi,* 2 vols., 1900.

Quadro elementas das relaçoes politicas e diplomaticas de Portugal, 18 vols., 1876.

Quicherat, Jules: *Procès de condamnation et de réhabilitation de Jeanne d'Arc,* 5 vols., 1849.

Rabanis: *Clement V et Philippe le Bel,* 1898.

Rabory: *Vie de sainte Françoise Romaine,* 1884.

Raguse, A. F. L. Marmont, duc de: *Monumenta Conciliorum.*

Ranke, Leopold von: *Histoire de France pendant les XVI^e^ et XVII^e^ siècles.*

Historisch-biographische Studien, 1877.

History of the Popes, tr. by E. Foster, 3 vols., 1912.

Rassegna Nazionale.

Raynaldi, Odorico: *Annales Ecclesiastici, 1198 to 1565,* 10 vols., 1679.

Rebellian, Alfred: *Bossuet, historien du protestantisme,* 1892.

Registres des Papes, published by the École Française at Rome.

Rémond, Florimond de: *De la naissance de l'hérésie.*

Reumont, Alfred von: *Geschichte der Stadt Rom,* 4 vols., 1870.

Ribera, Francisco de: *Vida de S. Teresa,* 1908.

Richelieu, Armand Jean du Plessis, duc de: *Mémoires.*

Traité pour convertir ceux qui se sont séparés de l'Eglise, 1651.

Richental, Ulrich von: *Chronik des Constanzer Concils,* 1882.

Rinieri, H.: *Beatrice Cenci, secondo i costituti del suo processo,* 1909.

Rio, Alexis: *De l'art chrétien,* 4 vols., 1874.

Robinson, Hastings (editor): *Original Letters Relating to the English Reformation,* 2 vols., 1846.

Romagnési, Vergniaud: *Histoire d'Orléans.*

Ronsard: *Œuvres complètes.*

Rousseau, J. J.: *Deuxième lettre de la montagne.*

Ruscelli, Girolamo: *Delle lettere di principi,* 3 vols., 1577.

Ruysbroeck, Jean de: *L'ornement des noces spirituelles,* 1911.

Rymer, Thomas: *Foedera,* 20 vols., 1735.

Sabatier, Louis August: *The Apostle Paul,* tr. by A. M. Hellier, 1912.
Sadoleto, Jacopo: *Opera,* 4 vols., 1738.
Saggio d'inventario degli archivi di Venezia, 1861.
Sainte Marthe, Scævola de: *Elogia gallorum illustrium.*
Saint Victor, Richard de: *Trinité.*
Salembier, Louis: *Petrus de Alliaco,* 1886.
The Great Schism of the West, tr. by M. D., 1907.
Sanudo, Marino: *I diarii,* 58 vols., 1903.
Sarpi, Paolo: *The History of the Council of Trent,* tr. by Nathanael Brent, 1676.
Savigny, Friedrich Carl von: *The History of the Roman Law during the Middle Ages,* tr. by E. Cathcart, 1829.
Savonarola, Girolamo: *The Triumph of the Cross,* 1901.
Schedel: *Chronica Chronicarum.*
Schmidt: *Les libertins spirituels,* 1876.
Segretain, E. A.: *Sixte Quint et Henry IV,* 1861.
Sepet, Marius: *Jeanne d'Arc,* 1896.
Serry: *Historia Congregationum de Auxiliis,* 1699.
Simon, Richard: *Histoire critique des principaux commentateurs du Nouveau Testament,* 1693.
Sigismondi, dei Conti da Foligno: *Le storie de suoi tempi,* 1883.
Sismondi, Jean Charles: *Histoire de France.*
Smith, Preserved (editor): *Life and Letters of Martin Luther,* 1911.
Société de l'histoire de Paris: *Mémoires.*
Sommervogel: *Bibliothèque de la Compagnie de Jésus.*
Sortais: *Fra Angelico.*
Spitzen: *Les hollandismes de l'Imitation,* 1884.
Nouvelle défense de Thomas à Kempis, 1884.
Stein: *Manuel de bibliographie générale,* 1897.
Strowski, Fortunat: *Pascal et son temps,* 3 vols., 1908.
Saint François de Sales, Introduction à l'histoire du sentiment réligieux en France au XVII^{e} *siècle,* 1898.
Suarez, Francisco: *De fide.*
De legibus.
Sugenheim: *Zustände Baierns.*

SULLY, Maximilien de Béthune, duc de: *Mémoirs,* tr. by Mrs. Charlotte Lennox, 4 vols., 1856.
SUSTA: *Die römische Curie und das Concil von Trient,* 1904.

TACHERET: *L'évolution religieuse de Guillaume le Taciturne,* 1904.
TANQUEREY: *Synopsis theologiae dogmaticae specialis.*
TAULER, John: *Institutions,* 1840.
Sermons and Conferences, 1910.
TERESA, St.: *Book of the Foundations.*
Histoire de S. Thérèse, d'après les Bollandistes, 2 vols., 1882.
Letters, tr. by the Benedictines of Stanbrook, 1919.
Life and Letters, tr. by Henry James Coleridge, 3 vols., 1896.
Œuvres, 4 vols., 1845.
St. Teresa of Jesus, tr. by David Lewis, 1910.
The Interior Castle, or the Mansion, tr. by the Benedictines of Stanbrook, 1912.
The Way of Perfection, tr. by the Benedictines of Stanbrook, 1911.
THAUSING, Moriz: *Albrecht Dürer, his Life and Works,* 2 vols., 1882.
THEINER, Augustine: *Acta genuina concilii Tridentini,* 1874.
Codex diplomaticus Dominii temporalis Sanctae Sedis, 3 vols., 1862.
THEODORE VON NIEHEIM: *De schismate papistico,* 1802.
THIERRY, Augustin: *The Formation and Progress of the Tiers-État, or Third Estate in France,* tr. by F. B. Wells, 2 vols., 1859.
THIRIOT: *Œuvres mystiques du bienheureux Henri Suso,* 1889.
THOMAS, Jules: *Le concordat de 1516, ses origines, son histoire au XVI^e siècle,* 3 vols., 1910.
THOMAS À KEMPIS: *Works,* tr. by J. P. Arthur, 1905.
THOMAS AQUINAS, St.: *De politica christiana,* 1647.
De regimine principum.
Summa Theologica, tr. by Fathers of the English Dominican Province, 16 vols., 1922.
THOMASSIN, Louis: *Ancienne et nouvelle discipline,* 3 vols., 1779.
Traité dogmatique et historique des édits et autres moyens dont

on s'est servi pour établir et maintenir l'unité de l'Eglise, 2 vols., 1703.

THUREAU-DANGIN, Paul: *The Life of Saint Bernardine of Siena,* tr. by Baroness G. von Hügel, 1911.

TIRABOSCHI, Girolamo: *Storia della litteratura italiana,* 20 vols., 1813.

TOMMASEO, Niccolò: *Le lettere di S. Caterina da Siena.*

TOMMASINI: *Fonti per la storia d' Italia,* 1890.

TOSTI, Luigi: *History of Pope Boniface VIII and his Times,* tr. by E. J. Donnelly, 1911.

TRÉSAL, J.: *Les origines du schisme anglican,* 1908.

TREVELYAN, George Macaulay: *England in the Age of Wycliffe,* 1920.

VACANDARD, Elphège: *Études de critique et d'historie religieuse,* 2 vols., 1910.

The Inquisition, tr. by Bertrand L. Conway, 1908.

VACANT-MANGENOT (editors): *Dictionnaire de Théologie.*

VAGIUS: *In vita Celestini.*

VAISSETTE, Jean Joseph: *Histoire générale de Languedoc,* 16 vols., 1904.

VALOIS, Noël: *Histoire de la Pragmatique Sanction de Bourges,* 1906.

La crise religieuse du XV^e^ siècle. Le pape et le concile, 2 vols., 1909.

La France et le grand schisme d'Occident, 4 vols., 1902.

VAN DEN GHEYN: *Catalogue des manuscripts de la bibliothèque royale de Belgique,* 1908.

VASARI, Giorgio: *Lives of Seventy of the Most Eminent Painters, Sculptors, and Architects,* tr. by Gaston de Vere, 8 vols., 1914.

VAZIO: *Relazione sugli archivi di Stato italiano,* 1883.

VENTURI: *Storia della Compania di Gesù in Italia.*

VERLAQUE, V.: *Jean XXII, sa vie et ses œuvres,* 1883.

VERSTEGAN, Richard: *Theatrum crudelitatis haereticorum nostri temporis,* 1587.

VIGILIUS: *Vita Vigilii.*

VIGOUREL, Adrian: *La liturgie et la vie chrétienne.*

VILLANI, Filippo: *Storie fiorentine,* 8 vols., 1803.
VILLARI: *Life and Times of Girolamo Savonarola,* tr. by Linda Villari.
VIOLLET, Paul: *Droit privé et sources. Histoire du droit civil français.*
Etablissements de saint Louis, 4 vols., 1886.
Précis de l'histoire du droit français, 2 vols., 1886.

WADDING, Luke: *Annales Ordinis Minorum.*
WALDAU: *Thomas Murner.*
WALKER, Williston: *John Calvin,* 1906.
WALLON, Henri Alexandre: *Jeanne d'Arc,* 1876.
WETZER AND WELTE: *Kirchenlexikon,* 2nd ed. by Card. Hergenröther.
WEISS, Nathanael: *La chambre ardente,* 1889.
WULF, Maurice de: *History of Medieval Philosophy,* tr. by R. Coffey, 1909.
WYCLIF, John: *Trialogus.*

ZABUGHIN, Vladimiro: *Giulio Pomponio Leto,* 2 vols., 1912.
ZARABELLA: *De jurisdictione imperiali,* 1566.
ZIMMERMANN: *Luthers Schriften.*

INDEX

Abbreviators, College of, 197, 269
Absolutism of French monarchy, 5
Academy of Florence, 273, 284
Accentibus et orthographis linguae hebraicae, De (by Reuchlin), 302
Achery, d' (Benedictine), 596
Acta martyrum (by Crépin), 473
Acta sanctorum (by the Bollandists), 593 note
Ad providam, Bull, 65
Adolph of Nassau (emperor), 23, 31
  Boniface VIII, 24
  Bull *Clericis laicos,* 27
  Edward I, 24
  Philip the Fair, 24
Adrets, Baron des, 482
Adrian VI (pope), 518-520
  Edict of Worms, 363
  Reform measures, 519
Adrian of Utrecht (Adrian VI), 518
Aegidius of Viterbo (card.), 206
Against the Papacy (by Luther), 384
Agardi, Guillaume, 63
Agincourt, Battle of, 175
Agnello of Pisa, 5
Agricola, 302
  Interim of Augsburg, 556
Ailly, Pierre d' (theologian), 153, 284
  Council of Constance, 143, 145 f., 151
  Papal authority, 122, 143
  Western Schism, 120, 126 f., 135
Aix, Seminary at, 590
Aix-la-Chapelle, 355
Albergati, Nicolo (card.), 157, 181
Albert, duke of Austria (emperor), 23, 69
  Adolph of Nassau, 31
  Boniface VIII, 31
Albert V, duke of Bavaria, 576
Albert Berdini, Blessed, 277
Albert of Hapsburg, 4
Albert, Charlotte d', 233
Alberti, Leone (artist), 267
  St. Peter's, Rome, 266
Albornoz (card.), 101, 103, 107
Albrecht of Brandenburg (archbishop), 325
  Becomes Lutheran, 370
  Indulgence offerings, 326 note
Albret, Henri d' (king of Navarre), 451
Albret, Jeanne d' (queen of Navarre), 478
Alcala, University, 547, 613, 621
Alciati, Andrea (jurist), 461
Aleander, Jerome (card.), 357, 615
Alexander V (pope), 138 f.
  Election of, 138 note
Alexander VI (pope), 152, 214-237, 582
  American explorations, 236
  Charles VIII, 220
  Children of, 216 note
  League with Venice, 216
  Murder of duke of Gandia, 223
  Nepotism, 217
  Reform project, 223
  Savonarola, 229 f.
  Simony in election of, 214 note
Alexander of Hales (theologian), 38
Alfeld, August von (Franciscan), 347
Alfonso (claimant to Naples), 218
Alfonso, king of Naples, 181
Alfonso, king of Portugal, 187
Alfonso of Biseglia, 234
Allemand (card.), at Council of Basle, 162, 164
  Papal authority, 154
Allen (card.), 436
Alma Mater, Bull, 64
Almain, James (theologian), at Council of Pisa, 250
Almodie de Besse, 110
Altenburg, Miltitz and Luther at, 343
Altenstein (Germany), 361
Alumada, 597
Alva, Duke of, in Italy, 526
  Netherlands, 504 f.
Alvarez (card.), 525
Amadeus of Portugal, Blessed, 207

Amadeus of Savoy (antipope), 172
Amalfi (Italy), 9
Amboise, Conspiracy of, 481, 623
Amédée de Talaru, at Council of Basle, 172
American Indians, Pius V and, 533
Anabaptists, 381, 387, 412, 501, 504, 575
Anagni, 20
  Boniface VIII, 39 ff.
  Cardinals' meeting at, 118
Ancona (Italy), Pius II at, 195
Andrea del Castagno (painter), 265
Andrea Mantegna (painter), 276
Andrea Orcagna (painter), 266
Andrew Corsini, St., 48
Andrew of Perugia (missioner), 88
Angela de Merici, St., 607, 610
Angela of Foligno, Blessed, 48, 113
Angelico da Fiesole (painter), 277
  Eugene IV and, 265
Angelus, 186 note
Anger (Jesuit), 624
Angers (France), Slaughter of Huguenots at, 489
Anglican Church, *Book of Common Prayer,* 430
  Eucharist, 418
  Forty-two Articles, 421
  Real Presence, 418
  Six Articles, 412
  Ten Articles, 412
  Thirty-nine Articles, 432
Anglican Orders, 421, 430
Angoulême, Margaret d', 442, 446, 449, 451
  Calvin and, 465
  Heptameron, 443
  Miroir de l'âme pécheresse, 453
Annales Ecclesiastici (by Baronius), 607
Annates, 89, 181, 258
  Abolished in England, 402
  Council of Basle, 164
Anne Boleyn, 397 ff.
  Excommunicated, 404
  Executed, 413
  Marriage, 403
Anne de Pisseleu, 443
Anne du Bourg, 476
Anne Seymour, 413
Antilutherus (by Clichtove), 447
Antipopes, Benedict XIV, 151; Clement VIII, 151; Felix V (i.e., Amadeus of Savoy), 172; Pietro of Corbario, 86-88
Antitrinitarians, 575
Antoine de Bourbon, 475, 481
Antoine de Verceil, 207
Antonello da Messina, 276
Antoninus, St., *Regola di vita cristiana,* 180
  Summa, 193
Antwerp, 504
  Prosperity of, 502 note
Apocalypse, rejected by Luther, 363
"Apocalyptics," 148
"Apostolic Brethren," 148
Apostolic Secretaries, College of, 262, 267
Appeal to Rome, suppressed in England, 403
Appointment of bishops, Henry VIII and, 402 f.
  In England, 417
Aquaviva, Claudio (Jesuit), 619
Aquinas, *See* Thomas Aquinas
Arabic inscriptions, Templars and, 73 note
Arabic, Teaching of, 88
Aragon, Gregory XI and wars in, 111
Arande, Michel d' (bishop), 446, 449
Araoz (Jesuit), 621
Arbues, Peter, 209
Architecture, Gothic, 267
  Renaissance, 274 f.
Arcs (France), 112
Arezzo (Italy), 262
Aristocracy in France, 439
Aristotelianism, 283
Aristotle, Study of, 283, 285
Arles, Bishop of, and lay usurpation, 25
Armada, Spanish, 434
Armengol, Peter, 113
Armenians, 575
  Council of Basle, 167
Arrabiati, Party of the, 228, 230
Arras, League of, 506, 577
Art, Christian, 247
  Realism in, 23
Arthur, and Henry VIII's marriage, 395
Articles, *See* Anglican Church
Articles of Smalkalden (by Luther), 383
Ascoli, Jerome d', and Olivi, 75
Asterisci (by Luther), 346
Asti (Italy), Council of Pisa, 250

Asti, Bernardino d', at Council of Trent, 547
Aubert, Etienne (Innocent VI), 99
Auctoritate papae et concilii, De (by Cajetan), 250
Augenspiegel (by Reuchlin), 332
Auger, Edmund (Jesuit), 577
Augsburg Confession, 379, 383, 386, 511
Augsburg, Diet of, 373, 377-380, 520
Augsburg Interim, 386, 556
Augsburg, Luther at, 337 ff.
Augsburg, Peace of, 386
Augustinianism, Luther and, 320
Augustinians, Discalced, 202
  Luther, 312
  Popularity of, 204
  Protestantism and, 594
Ausculta fili, Bull, 15 note, 34, 37
Authority, Doctrine of ecclesiastical, 84
  Doctrine of political, 84
  Principle of, 130
  Royal, 12
Auto da fé, 580
Autun, Usurers in diocese of, 25
Auxiliis, Congregatio de, 637
Avignon, Clement V at, 51
  Jesuit college, 624
  Notre Dame des Doms, 261
  Papacy at, 47
  Papal library, 262
  Papal palace, 94, 261
  Purchase of, 96
  Renaissance, 261
  Seminary founded, 590
  Siege by Boucicaut, 127
  Tomb of John XXII, 261
  Worldliness at, 110
Avila (Spain), 597, 599, 601
  Convent of, 596

"Babylonian Captivity" of the papacy, *See* Avignon
Babylonian Captivity (by Luther), 364
Baccio, Picture of St. Sebastian, 212
Bacon, Nicholas, 429
Baius (theologian), 591, 634
Baliol, king of Scotland, 24
Ballue (card.), 210
Bañez, Dominic, 629, 637
Baptism, Heretical doctrine of, 76
Barbardino of Feltre, Blessed, 207
Barbieri (painter), 627
Barbo (i. e., Paul II), 196
Bari, Archbishop of, 115
Barletta, Gabriel, 206
Barlow (bishop), 430
Barnabites, 522, 595, 606
Baroncelli, tribune of Rome, 101
Baroncelli, Bernardo, 201
Baronius (card.), *Annales Ecclesiastici,* 608
  Roman Martyrology, 535
Barricades, Day of the, 494
Barrière, Jean de la, 596
Bartholomew a Martyribus (bishop), 591
  Council of Trent, 568
  Stimulus pastorum, 591
Bartholomew's Day, Saint, 484 ff.
Bartolommeo (painter), 279 f.
  Converted by Savonarola, 213
Barton, Elizabeth, Execution of, 405
Basle, Calvin at, 465
  Oecolampadius at, 369
  Pellicanus at, 368
Basle, Council of, 158 f., 182
  Annates, 164
  Armenians at, 167
  Authority of, 165
  Bull of dissolution, 160
  Opposition to pope, 161
  Orientals at, 167
  Reform decrees, 173
  Transferred to Ferrara, 164
Bassi, Matthieu, 595
Bavaria, 299
  Smalkaldic League, 381
Beatific vision, Doctrine of, 91
Beaulieu, Edict of, 491
Beaupère, John, Council of Basle, 160
Bebel, *Facetiae,* 310
  Triumphus Veneris, 333
Beccadelli, Condemned by Eugene IV, 164
Beda, Noël, 447, 450 f., 453, 461
Bedier, *See* Beda
"Beggars," 503
Beghards, 73, 292
Begue, Lambert de, 292
Beguines, 73, 292
Belgium, 507
Bellarmine, Robert (card.), 631 f.
  Authority of Council of Basle, 165
  Disputationes de controversiis, 633
Bellay, Guillaume du, 454
Bembo (card.), 277, 284

Benedict XI (pope), 42-46
  Beatified, 46
  Crusade, 46
  Death of, by poison, 46
  Excommunicates Colonna and Nogaret, 45
  Leaves Rome, 47
  Letter to Philip the Fair, 44
Benedict XII (pope), 92-95
  Bull *Summi Magistri,* 203 note
  Petrarch and, 264
  Reform measures, 94
Benedict XIII (pope), 115, 124-131
  Council of Pisa, 136 f.
  Deposed, 150
Benedict XIV (antipope), 151
  Estius and, 634
Benedictine monasteries, 202 f.
Benedictus Deus, Bull, 530
Benefices, 257 f.
Benevento, Duchy of, 221
Benincasa (*See* Catherine of Siena)
Beraud de Got (archbishop), 49
Berdini, Blessed Albert, 277
Bergamo, Bonagratia of, 82
Berlichingen, Götz von, 351
Bern (Swiss canton), 468
Bernard, St., and papal supremacy, 38
Bernard de Saisset (bishop), 33 f.
Bernardine de Bustis (Franciscan), 207, 211
Bernardine of Feltre, Blessed, 211
Bernardine of Siena, St., 180, 207, 277
  And Martin V, 157
Bernardon de la Salle, 119
Berquin, Louis de (Huguenot), 451 f.
Berthold de Rohrbach, Mysticism of, 292 f.
Bertrand, Nicholas (jurist), 250
Bertrand de Deaux (archbishop), 93
Bertrand de Got (Clement V), 49
Besme, and death of Coligny, 488
Bessarion (card.), 182, 184, 277
  Contra calumniatores Platonis, 285
  Council of Ferrara, 168
  Council of Florence, 169
  Eugene IV and, 164
  Greek Church union, 171
Beze, Theodore de, 482, 484, 503
  De haereticis a civili magistratu puniendis, 471
Bible, Council of Trent and canon of, 550
  German translations, 363 note
  Editions, 303
  Council of Trent and interpretation of, 550
  Luther at Erfurt, 310
  Luther and canon of, 310
  Luther's translation, 364 note
  Rule of faith, 548 f.
Biel, Gabriel, *Collectorium circa quatuor sententiarum libros,* 282
Bigamy of Philip of Hesse, 384
Biondo, Flavio, and Eugene IV, 164
Birel, John (Carthusian), 99 f.
Bishops, Appointment of, and Henry VIII, 402 f.
  Appointment of, in England, 417
  Right of residence, 566 f.
Black Penitents, Confraternity of, 609
Blessed Virgin, Immaculate Conception of, and Council of Trent, 552
Blois, States General, 494
"Bloody Mary," 428
Bobadilla, Nicholas (Jesuit), 614
Boccasini, Blessed Nicholas (Benedict XI), 41
Bockold, John (John of Leyden), 382
Bodenstein, Andreas (i. e., Carlstadt), 345 note
Böhme, Jacob, 387
Bohemia, John of, 79
Bohemians, and Luther, 354
Boleyn, Anne, 397 ff.
  Executed, 413
  Marriage, 413
Bollandists, *Acta Sanctorum,* 593 note
Bologna (Italy), 139, 521
  Council of Trent, 556
  Eugene IV at, 164
  Francis I and Leo X at, 257
Bologna University, 88
  Restoration of, 182
  Study of law at, 10
  Western schism, 135
Bonagratia (Franciscan), 82
  And Olivi, 75
Bonaventure, St., 281
"Bonfire of vanities," 228
Boniface VIII, 19-42
  Abdication of Pope Celestine, 31 note
  Adolph of Nassau, 24
  Albert of Austria, 31
  Anagni outrage, 39 ff.

- Arbitrator between France and England, 30
- Attempted condemnation of, 52 ff.
- Bishop of Metz, 25
- Bull *Ausculta fili*, 15 note, 34, 37
- Bull *Clericis laicos*, 19 ff.
- Bull *Ineffabilis*, 29 note
- Bull *Salvator mundi*, 34
- Bull *Super Petri solio*, 40
- Bull *Unam sanctam*, 38
- Calumnies regarding death of, 42
- Canonization of St. Louis, 30
- Charges against, 31
- Council at Rome (1302), 37
- Crusade, 23, 33
- Eric of Denmark, 24
- Feudalism, 3
- Flote, 14
- Lay usurpation, 25
- Legists, 15
- Letter from Pierre Flote, 4
- Letter to Edward I, 23 f.
- Letter to Philip the Fair, 23 f., 28 f.
- Papal supremacy, 30-39
- Pretended letter from Philip, 35
- Taxation of Church property, 18
- Templars, 58
- Truce between England and France, 29
- University of Paris, 20 f.
- Venice, 24

Boniface IX (pope), 123

Book of Common Prayer, 418, 421
- Condemned, 432
- Elizabeth's revision, 430

Bora, Catherine von, 376

Bordeaux, Jesuit college, 624
- Seminary founded, 590
- Slaughter of Huguenots, 489

Borgia, Alfonso (Callistus III), 186

Borgia, Caesar, 216 f., 221, 224, 239 ff.
- Marries Charlotte d'Albert, 233
- Murder of Duke of Gandia, 222

Borgia, Francesco, 621

Borgia, Juan, 222
- Legitimation of, 234

Borgia, Lorenzo, 210

Borgia, Lucretia, 217, 223
- Giovanni Sforza and, 224
- Marries Alfonso of Biseglia, 234
- Regency of papal palace, 234

Borgia, Rodrigo (Alexander VI), 208, 210, 214

Borgia, St. Francis, 186

Borromeo, St. Charles (*See* Charles Borromeo)

Bossuet, Authority of Council of Basle, 165

Botticelli (painter), 275 f., 279
- And Savonarola, 278

Bouchet, Jean (poet), 251

Boucicaut, Geoffrey de, Siege of Avignon, 127

Boulbon, Enemonde de, 110

Bourbon, Antoine de, 478, 481

Bourbon, Charles de (card.), 478, 494

Bourbon, Connétable de, Sack of Rome, 521

Bourbons, 477 ff.

Bourdoise, 590

Bourg, Anne du, 476

Bourges, Father Anger at, 624
- Slaughter of Huguenots at, 489
- Pragmatic Sanction of, 172-175, 190, 194

Bradwardine, Thomas, on predestination, 295

Bramante (architect), 267
- And Julius II, 244

Brandenburg (Germany), 299
- Albrecht of, 370

Brando (card.), and Council of Basle, 162

Braun, John, letter from Luther, 314

Breslau, Reformation preached at, 369

Brethren of the Common Life, 133 f., 202
- Luther as student, 307

Brethren of the Free Spirit, 74, 76, 292

Breviary, Revision of, 532, 540

Brewster, James, Execution of, 394

Briçonnet, Guillaume (bishop), 438 ff., 445 f., 449

Brielle (Netherlands), 505

Brigid of Sweden, St., 98 f., 109, 507
- Letter to Gregory XI, 109
- Mysticism of, 288

Brothers of St. John of God, 607

Brucciamento della vanità, 228

Bruges (Belgium), 504

Brunellesco (architect), 266, 275

Bruni, Francesco (humanist), 262

Bruni, Leonardo, 267
- Martin (Reformer), 455, 471
- Body exhumed, 427

Budé, Guillaume, 445, 461

- Bull, Golden (of Emperor Charles IV), 96, 102; (of Sixtus IV), 202
- Bulls, Papal:
  - *Ad providam,* 65
  - *Alma Mater,* 64
  - *Ausculta fili,* 15 note, 34, 37
  - *Benedictus Deus,* 530
  - *Clericis laicos,* 19, 25-30
  - *Cum multa,* 597
  - *Dudum sacrum,* 163, 165
  - *Ecclesiae catholicae,* 619
  - *Execrabilis,* 90
  - *Exiit qui seminat,* 74
  - *Exsurge Domine,* 352, 394
  - *In caena Domini,* 533
  - *Ineffabilis,* 29 note
  - *Laetamur in te,* 53
  - *Licet ab initio,* 523 note, 578
  - *Mare magnum,* 202, 204, 254
  - *Quoniam alto,* 160
  - *Regnans Dei,* 433
  - *Rex gloriae,* 55, 56 note
  - *Salvator mundi,* 34
  - *Sapienti consilio,* 269 note
  - *Summi Magistri,* 203 note
  - *Super Petri solio,* 40
  - *Unam sanctam,* 38
  - *Vocavit nos Pius,* 191
- Bundschuh, 372
  - At Worms, 361
- Buoncompagni, Ugo (Gregory XIII), 534
- Burgundy, Circle of, 501 f.
- Buridan, Jean, 284
- Bus, Caesar de, 608
- Bustis, Bernardine de (Franciscan), 207, 211

- Cabrières, Massacre of, 455 ff.
- Caesar Borgia, 216 f., 221, 224, 239-243
  - Marriage, 233
  - Murder of Duke of Gandia, 221 f.
- Caesar de Bus, 608
- Cajetan, St., and the Theatines, 603, 605
- Cajetan, Tommaso, Council of Pisa, 250
  - *De auctoritate papae et concilii,* 250
  - Luther, 337 ff.
  - Pico della Mirandola, 250
  - Staupitz, 316
  - Thomism, 283
- Calais, French taking of, 478
- Calasanctius, St. Joseph, 607 f., 610
- Calendar, Gregorian, 603 note
  - Gregory XIII and, 535
  - In France and Rome, 67 note
  - Luigi Lilio and, 535
- Calixtines, 166 note
- Callistus III (pope), 185-188, 269
  - Angelus, 186 note
  - Nepotism, 188
  - Portuguese colonies, 236 note
- Calmar, Union of, 508
- Calmet, Dom, 596
- Calvin, John, 368, 438, 459 ff.
  - At Basle, 465
  - At Collège de Fortet, 464
  - At Geneva, 467 ff.
  - At Nérac, 465
  - At Saintonge, 464
  - At Strasburg, 465
  - Commentary on Seneca's *De Clementia,* 463
  - Cranmer, 420
  - Death of, 484
  - *Defensor pacis,* 85 note
  - Doctrine of justification, 368 note
  - Institutes, 465 f.
  - Margaret d'Angoulême, 451, 465
  - Reputed infamy of, 460 note
- Calvinism, 459 ff.
  - At Geneva, 467 ff.
  - In France, 472 ff.
- Calvinists (*See* Huguenots)
- Camaldolese, 596
- Cambrai, and Bull *Clericis laicos,* 27
  - League of, 247
- Cambridge, University, 423
  - Bucer and Fagius, 418
  - Henry VIII's divorce, 400
- Camillians, 607, 609
- Camillus de Lellis, St., 607, 610
- Camoens, *Lusiads,* 626
- Campeggio, Lorenzo (card.), 397, 520
- Campion, Edmund (martyr), 434
- Campo Morto, Battle of, 199
- Candia (island), 138
- Canisius, St. Peter, 624
- Cano, Melchior (theologian), 580, 629
  - Council of Trent, 547, 557
  - *De Locis theologicis,* 634
- Canon law, and taxation, 17-19
  - Study of, 20
- Canon of Scripture, Council of Trent, 550
  - Luther, 363

Canons Regular, 596
Canterbury, Archbishop of, Cranmer appointed, 403
Canzoniere (by Petrarch), 262
Capistran, St. John, 182, 187 f., 207, 277
"Capitulation" at papal elections, 158
Capranica (card.), and Martin V, 157
  Council of Basle, 162
Capreolus of Rodez, 281
  Defensiones theologiae divi doctoris Thomae, 281
Capuchins, 522, 595
Caraffa, Carlo (card.), 526 f.
  Executed, 529
Caraffa, Giovanni Pietro (Paul IV), 523, 525, 538, 604 f., 614 f.
Carcano, Michele (Franciscan), 207
Carcassonne, Diocese of, 18
Cardinals, College of, and Sixtus V, 539
Carinthia, 576
Carlos, Don, 580
Carlstadt (Reformer), 324, 345
  At Wittenberg, 367
  Debate at Leipsic, 346 f.
  Sacramentary dispute, 373
Carmelites, 596 ff.
  Popularity of, 204
Carniola, 576
Carrache, Hannibal (painter), 627
  Augustine (painter), 627
Carranza (archbishop), 533
Carthusians (London), Martyrs, 406
  Papal authority, 404
Carvajal, Bernardino (card.), 236
  Council of Pisa, 249
  Juan (papal legate), 187
  Louis, at Council of Trent, 547
Castagno, Andrea del (painter), 265
Castel Sant' Angelo, 114, 184
Castellion, Sébastien, 471
Castile, Wars in, 111
Catanei, Vanozza, and Rodrigo Borgia, 210
Catechism, Heidelberg, 386
Catechism of Trent, 609
Catechism, Roman, 532, 585
Catharinus, Ambrose, at Council of Trent, 547, 551
Catherine de' Medici, 453, 479 ff., 484 f., 521, 591
  Council of Trent, 548, 574
  St. Bartholomew's Day, 487 f., 490
Catherine de' Ricci, St., esteem for Savonarola, 233
Catherine Howard, executed, 413
Catherine of Aragon, 393 ff., 406
  Divorce declared, 403
Catherine of Siena, St., 109
  Clement VII, 131
  Embassy to Gregory XI, 111
  Gregory XI, 110 f.
  Mysticism, 288
  Urban VI, 131
  Western schism, 120, 131
Catherine of Sweden, St., Western schism, 120
Catherine Parr, 413
Catherine von Bora, 376
Cauvin, Charles, excommunicated, 460
  Gerard, excommunicated, 460
  John (*See* Calvin)
Cazalla, Agostino, executed, 580
  Francesco, executed, 580
  Pedro, executed, 581
Cecil, William, 429
Celestine V (pope), 19 f.
  Abdication of, 31 note
  Canonization of, 53
  "Fratricelli," 31
Cella-Robandi, Chartreuse of, 112
Cellier (Benedictine), 596
"Cenacle of Meaux," 445 ff.
Cental (France), 456
Cerfroy, Abbey of, 596
Cervantes (card.), Council of Basle, 162
Cervini, Marcello (Marcellus II), 525
  Michele (card.), Council of Trent, 545, 554
Cesarini, Giuliano (card.), Council of Basle, 157 f., 160, 162, 164, 172
  Martin V and, 157
Cesena (Italy), Massacre, 119
Chaise-Dieu, Abbey of, 203
Chalcocondylas, Demetrius, 270
Chaldean, Teaching of, 88
Chaldeans, Council of Basle, 167
Chamber of the Edict, 499
Chambéry (France), Jesuit college, 624
Chambre Ardente, 473
Chant, Gregorian, 628
Charité-sur-Loire, La, 485
Charles I (King of Spain), 356
Charles IV (emperor), 98
  And city of Florence, 108
  At Rome, 104

Coronation, 102
 Issues the Golden Bull, 102
Charles V (emperor), 362, 383, 395, 419, 521, 560 f., 579
 Anabaptists, 501
 At Worms, 360 f.
 Clement VII and, 521
 Coronation oath, 355
 Council of Trent, 555 f., 559
 Diet of Augsburg, 378
 Francis I and, 523, 544
 Letter to Queen Mary, 424
Charles V (king of France), Election of Urban VI, 117
 Letter to cardinals at Anagni, 119
Charles VI (king of France), Western schism, 126
Charles VII (king of France), 177
 Council of Basle, 172 f.
 Crowned at Rheims, 176
Charles VIII (king of France), 218
 And Alexander VI, 220
 And Italy, 219
 And Savonarola, 219 f.
 Enters Florence, 220
Charles IX (king of France), 438, 477, 485, 591
 Council of Trent, 570
 Jesuits, 623
 Pius V and, 532
 St. Bartholomew's Day, 487 ff.
Charles X (king of France), 494
Charles IX (king of Sweden), 510
Charles Borromeo, St., 529, 532, 577, 583 ff., 591
 Consulta, 530
 Pius V and, 592
 Proposed marriage, 585 note
 Seminaries, 586 ff.
Charles de Bourbon, 494
Charles of Anjou, 20 f.
Charles of Durazzo, and Clement VII, 121
 And Urban VI, 121
Charles of Luxemburg, 96
Charles of Valois, 69
 And Templars, 63
Charlier, Jean (*See* Gerson, Jean)
Charlotte d'Albert, marriage to Caesar Borgia, 233
Charterhouse (London), Martyrs of, 406
 Papal authority, 404
Chartreuse of Cella-Robandi, 112
Chassanée (magistrate), 455
Châteaubriand, Madame de, 443
 Edict of, 473
Châtillon, Cardinal de, 479 note
Chiavelli, Assassination of the, 200
Chieregato, 363
China, Missions in, 88
Chinon, Trial of Templars at, 61
Christian I (king of Denmark), Crusade funds, 187
Christian II (king of Denmark), 508
Christian art, 247
Christian Doctrine, Secular Clerics of, 609
Chrysoloras, 267
 Council of Constance, 157
Church and State, 85
Church of England (*See* Anglican Church)
Church property, Taxation of, 17-19, 45
Cibo, Giovanni (Innocent VIII), 208
Circle of Burgundy, 501 f.
Cistercians, 596
Citeaux, Order of, and taxation, 18 f.
 "Commendatory abbots," 203
Cities, Poverty of workers in, 7
 Development of free, 4
Città di Castello, Rebellion, 107
Civil law, and taxation of church property, 17-19
 Study of, 20
Civitavecchia fortified, 216
Clandestinity, Impediment of, 564
Classes in French society, 439 ff.
Claude, duke of Guise, 478
Clement V (pope), 49-71
 Bishopric of Peking, 88
 Bull *Ad providam*, 65
 Bull *Alma Mater*, 64
 Bull *Laetamur in te*, 53
 Bull *Rex gloriae*, 55
 Charges against, 60
 Conference at Poitiers, 52
 Death of, 77
 Edward II, 71
 Letter from Philip, 55
 Letter to Philip the Fair, 59
 Settles at Avignon, 51
 Templars, 58 ff.
Clement VI (pope), 95-99, 107
 And Petrarch, 264

  Black plague, 99 note
Clement VII (Avignon pope), 123
  Catherine of Siena, St., 131
  Charles of Durazzo, 121
Clement VII (Roman pope), 520-522, 595, 604
  At Orvieto, 397
  Barnabites, 606
  Charles V, 521
  Francis I, 453, 521
  French heretics, 448
  Henry VIII, 397
  Somaschi, 606
Clement VIII (antipope), 151
Clement VIII (pope), 540
  And Henry of Navarre, 494, 497
  Doctrinaires, 609
  Thomism and Molinism, 637
Clementine College, 606
Clementines, The, 71 note
Clerics of St. Mayeul, Regular, 606
Clerics of St. Paul, Regular, 606
Clericis laicos, Bull, 19, 25-30
Clerics of Christian Doctrine, Secular, 609
Clergy, and taxation, 17-19
  In France, 440
Clermont, Collège de, 624
Cleves, Jeanne of, 413
Clichtove, Josse, 445 ff.
  Antilutherus, 447
Clitherow, Margaret, Execution of, 434
Cluny, Abbey of, 203
  Abbot of, and right of taxation, 250
Coburg (Germany), Luther at, 380
Cognac (France), 485
Coimbra, The Aristotle of, 630
Colchester, Abbey of, 414
Colet, John, and the English Reformation, 392
Coligny, Gaspard de, 479, 484 f., 486 f., 505
  Murder of, 488
Colle, Bonifacio da, 604
Collectorium circa quatuor sententiarum libros (by Gabriel Biel), 282
College, Clementine, 606
Collège de Clermont, 624
Collège de Fortet, 464, 493
Collège de France, 441, 462
College of Abbreviators, 269
  Paul II and, 197
College of Apostolic Secretaries, 262, 267
College of Cardinals, Sixtus V and, 539
College of Navarre, 453
College, Roman, 534, 590
Collette, St., and Western schism, 120, 132 f.
Colloquy of Poissy, 482
Cologne, Jesuits at, 622
Colombini, Blessed John, 48, 103, 113
Colonna family, 180
  Alliance with Charles VIII, 218
  And Orsini, 46, 93
  And Pius III, 241
  Masters of Rome, 43
Colonna, Giacomo (card.), and Boniface VIII, 30 f.
Colonna, Otto (Martin V), 151
Colonna, Pietro (card.), and Boniface VIII, 30 f.
Colonna, Sciarra, 86
  And the Anagni outrage, 40 ff.
  Excommunicated, 45
Columbus, Christopher, 235
Comet, Exorcism of, 186 note
"Commenda," 203 note
Commendation, Abuse of, 203
Commendone, Giovanni (card.), 533
Commentary on Epistles of St. Paul (by Lefèvre), 444
Commines, Philippe de, 219
Common law, 10
Common Life, Brethren of the, 133 f., 202
Common Prayer, Book of, 418, 421
  Condemned, 432
  Elizabeth's revision, 430
Communion, Instruction on (England, 1548), 417
Compactata of Prague, 166
Compromis des Marchands, 503
Compromis des Nobles, 503
Concord, Formula of, 386
Concord of Free Will with the Gifts of Grace (by Molina), 636
Concordats:
  France (1516), 174, 255, 258 ff., 440
  Princes', 175
  Vienna, 175, 181
Concordats, Era of, 154
  Council of Constance, 154
Concordia catholica, De (by Nicholas of Cusa), 162

Conde, Prince de, 475, 479, 481, 485, 491
Condulmaro, Gabriello (Eugene IV), 159
Conference of Marburg, 378
Confessio Hungarica, 511
Confession, Augsburg, 511
"Confession of Faith of the French Churches," 475
Congregation "De Auxiliis," 637
Congregation of the Oblates, 585
Congruism, 630
Conjecturis temporum, De (by Nicholas of Cusa), 286
Conrad of Gelnhausen, 130
  Calling of Council, 127
  Western schism, 120
Conseil de paix (poem), 251
Consensus Sendomiriensis, 511
Consilium pacis, 128
"Consistory," at Geneva, 470
  In France, 472
Conspiracy of Amboise, 481, 623
Constance, Bishop of, and Indulgences, 326
Constance, Council of, 140-147
  Concordats, 154
  Ecumenicity, 147 note
  Gerson, 129
  Hus, 147
  John XXIII, 145
  Periodic councils, 154
  Study of ancient literature, 157
Constantinople, taken by Turks, 185
Constitution *Quantum religio,* 620
Consulta, 530
Contarini (card.), 523, 615
Contempt for the World (by Savonarola), 211
Contemptu mundi, De (by Petrarch), 263
Contra calumniatores Platonis (by Bessarion), 285
Contra parvas datas (by Dumoulin), 474
Controversiis Christianae Fidei, De (by Bellarmine), 633
Cop, Nicholas (Huguenot), 464
  And Calvin, 463
Copts, at Council of Basle, 167
Corbario, Pietro of (antipope), 86-88
Cordeliers, 206, 464
Corneto (Italy), Urban V met at, 103
  Urban V sails from, 104
Coronation oath, Imperial, 355
Corpus Juris Canonici, Gregory XIII and, 535
Corrario, Angelo (Gregory XII), 124 note
Correr, Antonio (card.), and Martin V, 157
Corvaro, Pietro da (antipope), 86-88
Cosimo de' Medici, 265, 270
Cossa, Balthasar (John XXIII), 139
  And Alexander V, 138
  Council of Pisa, 137
Cotta, Ursula, 308
Council, Authority of, 122, 146
  Calling of, 127, 135
  Congregation of, 539
  Ecumenical, Infallibility of, 162
  Theories of, 153
"Council of Union," Greek Church, 167
Councils:
  Basle, 158 f., 164 f., 182
  Constance, 129, 140, 142 ff., 147, 154, 157
  Ferrara, 164, 167, 169
  Florence, 169
  Lateran, 253
  London, 130
  Lyons, 166
  Pisa, 129, 136 ff., 249 ff.
  Rome (1302), 37
  Siena, 156
  Trent, 542 ff.
  Vienne, 64 ff., 72 f., 76, 87, 90, 292, 542
Councils, Authority of, 84
Courtenay, and Queen Mary, 424
Courtrai, Philip the Fair defeated at, 37
Coutances (France), 13
Coutras, Battle of, 494
Cranmer, Thomas (archbishop), 398, 400, 413, 415-417, 422, 424
  Appointed archbishop of Canterbury, 403
  Calvin and, 420
  Deposed, 423
  Excommunicated, 404
  Executed, 427
  Execution of Elizabeth Barton, 405
  Forty-two Articles, 421
  Henry VIII's divorce, 403
Crecy, Battle of, 95
Credi, Lorenzo di (painter), 276, 278
Crépin, Jean, *Acta martyrum,* 473

Crescenzio (card.), Council of Trent, 557
Crespy, Peace of, 544
Cromwell, Thomas, 398-401, 412 f.
  Execution of Elizabeth Barton, 405
  Henry VIII's vicar general, 404
  Pilgrimage of Grace, 411
Cronaca, Simone, and Savonarola, 278
Crusade, Boniface VIII and, 23, 33
  Callistus III, 187
  John XXII, 79
  Paul II, 196
  Pius II, 191, 194
  Preached in 1365, 104
  Sixtus IV, 199
Cryfts, Nicholas (*See* Nicholas of Cusa)
Crypto-Calvinists, 575
Cum multa, Bull, 597
Curia, Roman, Reorganized, 578
Cuspinian, Johannes, 302
Cyprus, and crusade, 104
  Templars in, 64
Cyril Lucaris (patriarch), 511 note

D'Ailly (*See* Ailly, Pierre d')
Danes, Peter (Hellenist), 461
Danse macabre, 310
Dante, 70, 93
  De Monarchia, 82
  Divina Commedia, 90, 269
  Doctrine of government, 70 note
  Exiled, 262
Date, "Great" and "Little," 474 note
Day of the Barricades, 494
Decline of feudalism, 3-8
Decline of the Church (by Savonarola), 211
Decretals, 22
"Defender of the Faith," 364
Defensiones theologiae divi doctoris Thomae, 281
Defensor pacis, 83
  And Calvin, 85 note
Del Monte (Julius III), 556
Delphine, St., 48, 112
Demetrius Chalcocondylas, 270
Denmark, Persecution in, 23
  Smalkaldic League, 381
  Union with Norway and Sweden, 508
  Western schism, 120
Deploration de l'Eglise militante (poem), 251
Deposition of pope, at Council of Pisa, 137
Dernbach, Balthasar von, 576
Deutsch Theologia (by Luther), 295 f., 320
  Orthodoxy of, 296 note
Deventer (school), 301
Devil, Luther's debate with, 366
Diana of Poitiers, 473, 479
Didier of Rotterdam (i. e., Erasmus), 304 note
Diet of Augsburg, 377-380, 520
  Melanchthon at, 373
Diet of Nuremberg, 80, 363, 370, 520
Diet of Ratisbon, 383
Diet of Worms, 357-362
Dietrich von Nieheim, and Western schism, 120
Disputationes de Controversiis Fidei (by Bellarmine), 633
Disputationes metaphysicae (by Suarez), 630
Divina Commedia (by Dante), 269
Divine Love, Society of, 604
Dividuo et individuo, De (by Dumoulin), 475
Docta ignorantia, De (by Nicholas of Cusa), 286
Doctrinaires, 609
Dogmatic Syncretism, 386 f.
Dolet, Étienne (Huguenot), 453 note
Domenichi, Domenico de (bishop), Reform project, 192
Domenichino (painter), 627
Dominicans, at Council of Trent, 547
  Popularity of, 204
Dominici, Blessed Giovanni, 206
  Regola del governo di cura familiare, 180
Donatello (sculptor), 265 f., 275
  And Savonarola, 278
Donations by the clergy, 17-19
Dons gratuits, 17-19
Dorothea, Princess, Marriage of, 370
Douai (France), 433
  University of, 634
Dubois, Pierre (legist), 13 f.
  And Innocent IV, 32
  Charges against Clement V, 60
  De recuperatione terrae sanctae, 52
  French domination, 32 f., 52, 69
  Templars, 60
Duchatel, Pierre (humanist), 453

Dudum sacrum, Bull, 163, 165
Duke of Gandia, Murder of, 223 note
Dumoulin, *Contra parvas datas,* 474
  De dividuo et individuo, 475
Duns Scotus, 83
Duprat (chancellor), 257 f.
Durandus, William (bishop), 72
  And Council of Vienne, 90
Dürer, Albrecht (painter), 368
Duynsen, Godefried van (martyr), 506

Ebernburg, Castle of, 368, 371
Ecclesiae catholicae, Bull, 619
Ecclesiastical authority, Doctrine of, 84
Eck, John, "Master" (theologian), 283, 301, 353
  Debate at Leipsic, 346 f.
  Manner of preaching, 289
  Mysticism, 289 f., 295
  Obelisci, 345
  Propositions condemned, 290
Ecumenicity of Council of Pisa, 136
Edict of Beaulieu, 491
Edict of Châteaubriant, 473
Edict of Nantes, 438, 498 ff.
Edict of Worms, 520
Editions of the Bible, 303
Education, and Jesuits, 622 ff.
Edward I (king of England), 14
  And Bull *Clericis laicos,* 27
  Letter from Boniface VIII, 23 f.
Edward II (king of England), and Clement V, 71
  And Templars, 63
Edward III (king of England), 71, 105
Edward VI (king of England), 413, 416 ff.
  Ordinal, 430
Efficacious grace, 636 ff.
"Eidgenossen," 468
Eisenach (Germany), 314, 362
  Luther at, 308
Eisleben (Germany), 306
Elections, Papal, 114
Elizabeth (queen of England), 429 ff., 591
  Alliance with Puritans, 436
  And Mary Stuart, 433
  And Paul IV, 430
  And Queen Mary, 426
  Birth of, 403
  Book of Common Prayer, 430
  Death, 436
  Dislike of the Puritans, 435
  Excommunication of, 433
  Oath of Supremacy, 431
  Plots in behalf of, 425
  Thirty-nine Articles, 432
Elizabeth of Hungary, St., 113
Elizabeth of Portugal, St., 48, 113
Eltz, Jacob von (archbishop), 576
Elzear, St., 48, 112
Embrun, Diocese of, 93
Emiliani, St. Jerome, 606
Emmerich (school), 301
Empire and Papacy, 4
Empire in Italy, 68
Emser, Jerome, 309, 347
Enemonde de Boulbon, 110
England, Church of (*See* Anglican Church)
  Concordat of Martin V, 154
  Laws against papal levies, 102
  Opposition against papal taxes, 104
  Peace with France, 111
  Protestantism in, 390-437
  Reconciliation with Rome, 425
  Templars in, 63
  Western schism, 120
"English Terror," 406
Eobanus Hessus, 335
Ephesus, Mark of, 168
  Council of Ferrara, 168
  Council of Florence, 169
Episcopal residence, Council of Trent, 566 f.
Epistle of St. James, Luther and, 363
Epistle to the Hebrews, Luther and, 363
Epistolae obscurorum virorum (by Rubianus), 332
Erasmus, 302, 304, 332 f., 350, 352, 392, 451
  And Protestantism, 305
  At Erfurt, 305
  Beda and, 447
  Commentary on the New Testament, 302, 305
  De libero arbitrio, 372
  Francis I, 441
  Luther, 334
  Praise of Folly, 392
Erfurt, Erasmus at, 305
  Luther at, 312-324
  Papal Bull, 353
Erfurt University, 359
  Humanism, 333

Luther at, 308, 310
Eric (king of Denmark), 24
Eric XIV (king of Sweden), 510
Eriksson, Gustavus, 509
Espagne, Cardinal d', 41
Estius, William, 634
Estoile, Pierre de l', and Calvin, 461
Estouteville, d' (card.), 182
Etampes, Duchesse d', 443, 453
Etaples (*See* Lefèvre d'Etaples)
Eucharist, Anglican Church and, 418, 421
  Council of Trent, 557 f., 563
  Lutheran dispute, 373-376
Eugene IV (pope), 153, 159-177, 597
  Bull *Dudum sacrum,* 163, 165
  Bull *Quoniam alto,* 160
  Conflict with Council of Basle, 161
  Deposition declared, 172
  Fra Angelico, 265
  Hussites, 162
  Masaccio, 264
Eugenicus, Marcus, and Council of Ferrara, 168
  Council of Florence, 169
Euse, Jacques d' (John XXII), 78
Evora, University of, 636
Execrabilis, Bull, 90
Exemplar (by Blessed Henry Suso), 291
Exemptions, Lateran Council and, 254
Exeter, Marchioness of, 406
Exiit qui seminat, Bull, 74
"Expectative graces," Suppression of, 258
Exsurge Domine, Bull, 352, 394
"Extravagantes," 339 note
Extreme Unction, Council of Trent and, 559

Faber, Peter (Jesuit), 614, 621
Fabriano, Gentile da (painter), 264
Facetiae (by Bebel), 310
Facetiae (by Poggio), 179, 183, 268 f.
Faenza (Italy), Jesuits at, 620
Fagius, Paul (Reformer), 418
  Body exhumed, 427
Faith, Rule of, Council of Trent, 548 f.
Falconieri, St. Juliana of, 113
Farel, Guillaume (Reformer), 445 f., 449, 455
  At Geneva, 468
Farnese, Alessandro (Paul III), 522
  In the Netherlands, 506
Farnese family, 524
Fasy, Jean de (Carmelite), 597
"Father of Letters" (Francis I), 441
"Father of Non-Conformists" (Hooper), 421
Fecamp, Abbey of, 203
Felix V (antipope), 172
  Abdication of, 175
Feltre, Blessed Bernardine of, 211
Ferdinand I (emperor), 561
  Council of Trent, 562
  Henry VIII, 410
  Jesuits, 622
Ferdinand II (emperor), 576
Ferdinand IV (king of Castile), and Templars, 63
Ferdinand V (king of Spain), 235
  Alliance with Julius II, 248
  Baptism of Jews, 209
Ferrante (king of Naples), 5, 218
Ferrara (Italy), Council of Basle transferred to, 164
  Council transferred to Florence, 169
  Greek Church at, 167
  League with Alexander VI, 216
  Pius II at, 210
Ferrari, Bartholomew (Barnabite), 606
Ferreri, Zaccaria (bishop), Council of Pisa, 250
Feudalism, 10 f.
  Boniface VIII, 3
  Decline of, 3-8
  Lollards, 5
  War of the Roses, 5
  Western schism, 4
Feuillant, Monastery of, 596
Feuillantines, 596
Feuillants, 596
Ficino, Marsilio, 271, 273 f., 278
  De religione christiana, 285
  Neoplatonism, 283
  Theologia platonica, 285
  Work on Plato, 274 note
Fiesole, Monastery of, 277
Filastre, Guillaume (card.), 135
Filelfa, Francesco (humanist), 267, 268 note
"Filioque," at Council of Ferrara, 168
Filippino Lippi (painter), 275
Filippo Lippi (painter), 265, 275
Fire, Ordeal of, and Savonarola, 230 f.

First Blast of the Trumpet (by Knox), 435
Fisher, Blessed John, 401 f., 406 ff.
Flora, Joachim of, Idealism, 122
Florence (Italy), 43, 46
  Academy of, 273, 284
  Arrabiati, 228, 230
  "Bonfire of vanities," 228
  Council of, 169
  Emperor Charles IV, 108
  Eugene IV at, 164
  Factions in, 201
  Guelfs and Ghibellines in, 23
  Insurrection headed by, 107
  Interdicted, 108
  King Charles VIII, 220
  Martin V at, 155
  Medici, 270
  Papal nuncio flayed alive, 108
  Power of, 5
  St. Catherine's embassy, 111
Florent of Holland, and Philip the Fair, 24
Flores sanctorum, 613
Flote, Pierre (legist), 4, 14, 34
  Bull *Ausculta fili,* 37
  False Bull, 35
  States General of 1302, 36
Fonseca, Pedro da (Jesuit), 630
Forge, Étienne de la (Reformer), 464
"Form," Meaning of, 76 note
Formula of Concord, 386
Fornovo, Battle of, 221
Fortet, Collège de, 493
  Calvin at, 464
Forty-two Articles, of the Anglican Church, 421
Fourier, St. Peter, 596
Fournier, Jacques (Benedict XII), 93
Fox (bishop), 413
France, Concordat of Martin V, 154
  Intervention in Italy, 243
  Legists in, 9-12
  Liberated by Joan of Arc, 176
  Monarchical absolutism in, 5
  Nobility in, 6, 439
  Peace with England, 111
  Protestantism in, 438 ff.
  Revolutionary spirit in, 6-8
  Royal power, 440 f.
  Scheme for dominance of, 52
  Western schism, 120
France, Collège de, 462
Frances of Rome, St., 157
Francesca, Pietro della (painter), 265 f.
Francis I (king of France), and Anne de Pisseleu, 443
  Berquin's sacrilege, 451
  Cabrières massacre, 457
  Captivity of, 447, 451
  Character of, 441
  Charles V, 395, 523, 544
  Clement VII, 453, 521
  Collège de France, 441
  Henry VIII, 405, 410
  Imprimerie Royale, 441
  Leo X, 256
  Letter from Paul III, 454
  Louvre, 441
  Madame de Châteaubriand, 443
  Protestantism, 438
  Smalkaldic League, 381
Francis II (king of France), Factions, 477
  Jesuits, 623
  Marriage, 433
  Protestantism, 438
Francis Borgia, St., 186, 619
  Pius V and, 592
Francis de Sales, St., Writings of Tauler, 291
Francis of Paula, St., King Louis XI and, 199
  Order of Minims, 202
Francis of Vittoria, 634
  Doctrine on war, 629
Francis Xavier, St., 614, 621
Franciscans, and Nicholas III, 74
  At Council of Trent, 547
  Popularity of, 204
  Privileges extended, 202
"Fratricelli," 74
  Acts of martyrdom, 122
  And Celestine V, 31
Frederick II (emperor), 20, 113, 299
  And Dubois, 32
Frederick III (emperor), 175, 191
  Coronation at Rome, 183
Frederick, duke of Saxony, 342 f.
  At Diet of Worms, 358
  Kidnapping of Luther, 361
Free cities, Development of, 4
Free Spirit, Brethren of the, 76, 292
French society, Classes in, 439 ff.
Friars Minor (*See* Franciscans)
Frith, John, executed, 412

Frundsberg, Sack of Rome, 521
Fuggers (bankers), 325, 326 note

Gaetani, Benedetto (Boniface VIII), 20
Gaetani, Tommaso (*See* Cajetan)
Gallicanism, 245 f.
Gandi, Murder of Duke of, 221 f.
Garde, Paulin de la, 456 f.
Gardiner, Stephen (bishop), 413, 423, 425
  Imprisoned, 418
Garnier, Bernard (antipope Benedict XIV), 151
Gates, John, executed, 423
Gelasius I (pope), 582
Gelnhausen, Conrad of, 130
  Calling of council, 127
  Western schism, 120
Gemistus Plethon, 270, 277
Geneva, Calvin at, 469 ff.
  Knox at, 435
Genoa, war with Venice, 24
Gentile da Fabriano (painter), 264 f.
Geoffrey de Boucicaut, Siege of Avignon, 127
Geoffrey of Vendôme, and papal supremacy, 38
George, duke of Saxony, 322, 346
George the Bearded, duke of Saxony, 569
George, Junker (i. e., Luther), 362
German nobility, To the (by Luther), 351
German Renaissance, 299-305
Germany, Clergy of, 301
  Concordat of Martin V, 154
  Gregory XI, 111
  Innocent VI, 102
  Lutheranism in, 350-389
  Revolutionary parties, 350 f.
  Templars in, 64
  Western schism, 120
Gerson, Jean, 153, 284
  Council of Constance, 143 f., 151
  La réforme de la théologie, 129
  Mendicité spirituelle, 129
  Mysticism, 288
  Papal authority, 122, 144
  Western schism, 120, 128
Gertrude, St., 48, 113
Gesta Dei per Francos (by Bongars), 52 note
Gesù, Church of the (Rome), 627
Ghent, 504
  Pacification of, 506
Ghibellines, 80, 536
  And Guelfs, 23, 43, 68
Ghiberti (sculptor), 275
Ghirlandajo, Domenico (painter), 275 f.
Ghislieri, Michele (Pius V), 432, 530, 538
Gilberti, Matteo (bishop), 583
Giles of Viterbo (Augustinian), 251, 255, 277
Giotto (painter), 264
Giovanni de' Medici (Leo X), 210, 252, 273
Giuliano de' Medici, Assassination of, 201
Giulio Sanseverino (*See* Pomponius Laetus)
Glastonbury, Abbey of, 414
Godefried of Mervel (martyr), 506
Godefried van Duynsen (martyr), 506
Golden Bull (of Emperor Charles IV), 96, 102
Golden Bull (of Sixtus IV), 202
Golden League, 577
Golden Rose, bestowed on Caesar Borgia, 234
"Good Queen Bess," 429
Gorkum, Martyrs of, 505 f.
Gothic architecture, 267
Gottlieben, John XXIII imprisoned at, 150
Gozzoli, Benozzo (painter), 265
Grace, Efficacious, 636 ff.
Grace, Pilgrimage of, 411, 413
Granada (Spain), 607
Grande Chambre, 475
Granvella (card.), 503 f.
Graz (Austria), Jesuit college, 534
Greek Church, 95
  And Protestantism, 511
  Council of Basle, 164
  Schism renewed, 171
  Union with Rome, 166-170
Greek College at Rome, 535
Greek literary culture at Florence, 269-274
Greek schism, abjured by John Palaeologus, 104
Greenland, Missions of, 235
Gregorian Chant, 628
Gregory IX (pope), and Templars, 58
Gregory XI (pope), 106-112

  And private revelations, 112 note
  And the return of the papacy to Rome, 92
  Embassy of St. Catherine to, 111
  Goes to Rome, 112
  Letter from St. Brigid, 109
  Letter from St. Catherine, 110 f.
  Papal elections, 114
Gregory XII (pope), 123 f.
  Council of Pisa, 136 f.
  Resignation, 150
Gregory XIII (pope), 534-537, 596
  Calendar reform, 535
  Colleges at Rome, 534
  Corpus Juris Canonici, 535
  Greek College, 535
  Oratorians, 608
  Roman College, 590
  Roman Martyrology, 535
  St. Bartholomew's Day, 490
Gregory XIV, 540
  And Henry of Navarre, 494
  Camillians, 608
Gregory XVI, Bull *Ecclesiae catholicae,* 619
  Jesuits, 619
Gregory of Valencia (Jesuit), 638
Grey, Jane, and Queen Mary, 423
  Executed, 425
  Proclaimed queen, 422
Grimoard, William (Urban V), 103
Gringoire, Pierre (poet), 251, 255
Groote, Gerard, 133
  Mysticism, 288
Guelfs, 87, 109, 536
  And Ghibellines, 23, 43, 68
Guercino, Il (painter), 627
Guerin (magistrate), 456 f.
Guerrero, Pedro, Council of Trent, 565 ff., 571
"Gueux," 503
  "— de mer," 505
  "— de terre," 505
Guicciardini, 278
  Political theories, 225
Guido Reni (painter), 627
Guipuscoa (Spain), 613
Guise, House of, 477 f., 485, 577
  Council of Trent, 562
Guise, Claude, duke of, 478
Guise, Francis, duke of, 478, 483
  Assassinated, 485
Guise, Henry, duke of, assassinated, 494
  The League, 493
Gustavus Adolphus (king of Sweden), 510
Gustavus Eriksson (Vasa), 509

Habsburg, Albert of, 4
  Rudolph of, 4
Hagenau, Conference at, 383
Hale, John (martyr), 407
Hamburg (Germany), Reformation preached at, 369
Hamsa (nephew of Scanderbeg), 188
Handspiegel (by Pfefferkorn), 332
Harding, Thomas, and English Catholics, 432
Hausschein, Johann (Oecolampadius), 369 note
Hebrew, Teaching of, 88
Hebrews, Epistle to, rejected by Luther, 363
Hegius, Alexander (humanist), 301
Heidelberg, Luther defends his doctrine at, 335
Heidelberg Catechism, 386
Heidelberg University, Conrad of Gelnhausen at, 127
Helen of Hungary, St., 113
Hemming (bishop), 98
Henrician bishops, 413
Henries, War of the Three, 494
Henry VII (emperor), 69
Henry VIII (king of England), and Anne Boleyn, 413
  Anne Seymour, 413
  Appointment of bishops, 402 f.
  Cardinal Pole, 411
  Catherine Howard, 413
  Catherine Parr, 413
  Death of, 415
  "Defender of the Faith," 364, 390
  Divorce, 395 ff.
  Excommunicated, 404
  Fisher, 407 f.
  Interdict, 410 f.
  Jeanne of Cleves, 413
  Marriage to Anne Boleyn, 403
  Melanchthon and, 412
  More, Thomas, 408 f.
  Oath of succession, 406
  Oath of supremacy, 406
  On vocal prayer, 393

  Smalkaldic League, 381
  Theology of the Sacraments, 394
  Wives, 413
Henry II (king of France), 521
  And Huguenots, 472 ff.
  Council of Trent, 557
  Jesuits, 622
Henry III (king of France), 438
  And Huguenots, 491
  Murder of, 494
Henry IV, king of France (Henry III of Navarre), 485, 492 ff.
  Conversion of, 495 ff.
  Council of Trent, 574
  Edict of Nantes, 498 ff.
  Marriage to Margaret of Valois, 486
Henry III, king of Navarre (*See* Henry IV, king of France)
Henry d'Albret, 451
Henry, duke of Guise, Assassination of, 494
  The League, 493
Henry of Langenstein (theologian), 130
  Calling of council, 127
  Western schism, 120
Henry of Luxemburg, 69
Heptameron (by Margaret d'Angoulême), 443
Herczuelo, executed, 581
Hesse, Landgrave of, 377 f., 384, 454, 521
Hessus, Eobanus, 335
Hofmann, Melchior (Anabaptist), 501
Hohenzollerns, 299
Holland, 503, 507
  Anabaptists, 382
Holy Ghost, Procession of, 168
Holy Land (*See* Crusade)
"Holy Maid of Kent" (Elizabeth Barton), 406
Holy Office, 578
  Paul IV and, 527
  Paul Veronese before, 627
  Philip II and, 533
Holy Orders, Council of Trent, 563
Honorius (pope), and study of Roman law, 21
Hooper, John (bishop), 421
Hôpital, Michel de l', 479 f., 482
Hospitallers of St. John of Jerusalem, 56 ff., 94
  And Templars, 65
Hotman, Charles, and the League, 493
Houghton, John (martyr), 407
Howard, Catherine, executed, 413
Hugh of St. Victor, 39 note
  And papal supremacy, 38
Huguenots, 468, 481
  Henry II and, 472 ff.
Humanism, Nicholas V and, 183
  Sixtus IV, 198
Humanists, and Luther, 330-335
Humiliati, Order of the, 585
Hungary, alliance with Venice, 194
  Overcome by Turks, 522
  Protestantism in, 511
  Western schism, 120
Hunyady, Janos, 175, 187 f.
Hus, John, 140, 147-149
  Council of Constance, 147
  Influence of Wyclif, 148
  Luther, 319
  Safe-conduct, 149 note
Hussites, 149, 166, 190
  At Zwickau, 367
  Demands of, 166 note
  Eugene IV, 162
  Luther and, 354
  Martin V's crusades against, 156
Hutten, Ulrich von (Reformer), 309, 333, 350-354, 356 f., 361, 372
  Epistolae obscurorum virorum, 332

Idealism, Platonic, 284
Ignatius Loyola, St., 538, 607, 613 ff.
  A Theatine? 614 note
  Emperor Ferdinand, 622
  Roman College, 534, 590
  The *Spiritual Exercises,* 639
Images, Destruction of, 419
Imitation of Christ, 133
Immaculate Conception, Council of Trent and, 552
Immensa aeterni Dei (Constitution), 578
Immortalitate animae, De (by Pomponazzi), 284
Impanation, Calvin's doctrine of, 368 note
Imperial vicars, 102
Imprimerie Royale, 441
In caena Domini, Bull, 533
Index, Congregation of the, 539
  Of forbidden books, 523, 581 f.

Indians (American), Pius V and, 533
Individualistic pietism, 387-389
Indulgences, Decree of, 325-328
  Leo X on, 342
  Luther, 327
  Luther's theses, 328
  Tetzel's antitheses, 329
  Thomas Wyttenbach, 295
Ineffabilis, Bull, 29 note
Infallibility, 82
  Of council, 162
Ingolstadt, Jesuits at, 622
Ingolstadt University, 576
Innocent IV, and Dubois, 32
  Inquisition, 578
Innocent VI, 99-103
  And the Golden Bull, 102 f.
  Reform measures, 100
  Rienzi, 101
Innocent VII, 123 f.
Innocent VIII, 208, 213
  Crusade project, 209
  Theses of Pico della Mirandola, 271
Innocent IX, 540
Inquisition, Beghards and Beguines, 292
  Development of the, 527 note
  In Italy, 579
  Jews, 199
  Paul IV, 527
  Philip II, 533
  Pius IV, 528
  Pius V, 533
  Reorganization of, 523
  Templars, 60 ff.
  Torture, 61 f., 578 note
Inquisition, Roman, 577 f.
Inquisition, Spanish, 511, 579 ff.
  In the Netherlands, 501
  Sixtus IV, 199
Institutes of the Christian Religion (by Calvin), 459, 465 f.
Institutiones divinae (by Tauler), 291
Instruction on Communion (England, 1548), 417
Interim of Augsburg, 386, 556
Interim of Ratisbon, 381, 383
Interior Castle (by St. Teresa), 644
Ireland, made a kingdom, 426
  Templars in, 63
Isabella (queen of Castille), 235
Italian cities, League of, 5
Italy, Anarchy in, 107
  And France, 243
  Concordat of Martin V, 154
  Inquisition in, 579
  Order restored by Card. Albornoz, 101
  Protestantism in, 511
  Templars in, 64
  The Empire in, 68
  Western schism, 120

Jacobites, Council of Basle, 167
Jacopone da Todi (poet), 31
Jacques de la Marche (Franciscan), 207
James II (king of Aragon), and Templars, 64
James I (king of England), and Puritans, 436
James, Epistle of St., rejected by Luther, 363
Janduno, John of (*See* John of Janduno)
Jane Grey, and Queen Mary, 423
  Executed, 425
  Proclaimed queen, 422
Jay, Claude le, at Council of Trent, 546
Jean de la Barrière (Cistercian), 596
Jean de Malestrout, 108
Jean le Maistre, condemnation of Joan of Arc, 176
Jeanne of Cleves, 413
Jerusalem Delivered (by Tasso), 626
Jesuates, 103
Jesuit churches, 627
Jesuits, 532, 595, 612 ff.
  Approbation of, 523
  Collège de Clermont, 624
  Colleges, 536
  Constitution *Quantum religio*, 620
  Council of Trent, 546
  Form of government, 616 ff.
  In Bavaria, 576
  In England, 434
  Monita secreta, 618 note
  Obedience, 619 note
  Schools, 622 ff.
  University of Paris, 624
Jesus, Society of (*See* Jesuits)
Jewish question in Germany, 331
Jewish writings, 331
Jews, in Germany, 331
  Inquisition, 199
  Usury, 331
Joachim of Brandenburg, at Diet of Worms, 358

Joachim of Flora, idealism, 122
Joan (regent of Spain), 580
Joan of Arc, 109, 175-178
  Irregularities in trial of, 176 note
  Rehabilitation, 188
Joanna of Naples, Urban VI's expedition against, 121
John III (king of Sweden), 510, 577
John XXII (pope), 78-92, 112
  Annates, 89
  Bull *Execrabilis,* 90
  Beghards and Beguines, 292
  Crusade, 79
  Defensor pacis, 86
  Doctrine of beatific vision, 91
  Louis of Bavaria, 80
  Marsilius of Padua, 83
  Teaching of Master Eckhart, 290
  The Empire, 79
  Tomb, 261
John XXIII (pope), 139-141
  Council of Constance, 145, 149
  Deposed, 149
  Imprisoned, 150
  Letter to Emperor Sigismond, 145
John Capistran, St., 182, 187 f., 207, 277
John Colombini, Blessed, 48
John Lackland (king of England), 105
John of Austria, 532
  In Netherlands, 506
John of Bohemia, 79
John of Janduno, 83 f., 86
  Doctrine, 283
John of Jerusalem, Knights of St. (*See* Hospitallers)
John of Leyden, 382
John of Naples (preacher), 206
John of Parma, idealism, 122
John of Polomar, Council of Basle, 160
John of Richemont (duke of Brittany), and Edward I, 24
John of Schwarzenberg, Council of Florence, 169
John of Swabia, 69
John of the Cross, St., 596, 602
  Mysticism, 646 note
John Palaeologus (emperor), abjures the Greek schism, 104
Jonas, Justus (Reformer), 330
Joseph Calasanctius, St., 607 f., 610
Joseph, Father, 596
Juan Borgia, 221 f.
  Legitimation of, 234
Jubilee of 1450, 183
Judgment of fire, Savonarola, 230 f.
Juliana Falconieri, St., 48, 113
Julius II (pope), 241-252
  Alliance with Ferdinand, 248
  Henry VIII, 395 f.
  Lateran Council, 248 ff.
  Louis XII, 440
  Simony in election of, 241 note
Julius III (pope), 524
  Council of Trent, 556
Julius de' Medici (Clement VII), 518
Junker Georg (i. e., Luther), 362
Jurisdiction, Ecclesiastical, 258
Jurisdictione imperiali, De, 143
Jus reformandi, 386
Justification, Calvin's doctrine, 368 note
Justification, Council of Trent on, 552 ff.

Kent, "Holy Maid" of (Elizabeth Barton), 406
Knights of St. John of Jerusalem (*See* Hospitallers)
Knights Templars (*See* Templars)
Knights, War of the, 351
Knox, John (Reformer), 421, 435
  First Blast of the Trumpet, 435
Königsberg (Germany), 371
Köppe, Leonard, and Catherine von Bora, 376
Kranach, Lucas (artist), 354
Kreuznach (Germany), 368

La Charité-sur-Loire, 485
Ladislas (king of Hungary), 175
Ladislas (king of Naples), 140
Lady of Victory, Feast of Our, 532
Laetamur in te, Bull, 53
Laetus, Pomponius (humanist), 197, 271 f.
Lainez, James (Jesuit), 614, 616, 620, 630
  At Council of Trent, 547, 557
Lambert le Begue, 292
"Landbeggars," 505
Lang, Matthew (bishop), 248
Lange, Johann (Hellenist), 309, 330
Langen, Rudolph von (humanist), 330
Langenstein, Henry of, 130, 153
  Calling of council, 127
  Consilium pacis, 128
  Western schism, 120
La Rochelle (France), 485, 499

Lateran Council, 248-252
  Exemptions, 254
  Leo X, 253
  Mendicant Orders, 254
  Project of reform, 253
Latimer (bishop), 413
Latour, Didier de, 596
Lavalette, Master, 591
Law, Canon, Study of, 20
Law, Civil, and taxation of Church property, 17-19
  Study of, 20
Law, Common, 10
  And taxation, 17
Law, Roman, 11, 22
  Study of, 9-11, 21
Lawrence, Robert (Carthusian), martyred, 407
Layton, Richard, and English monasteries, 413
Lazare, Congregation of St., 590
League, Golden, 577
League of Arras, 506, 577
League of Cambrai, 247
League of French Catholics, 490 ff.
League, Smalkaldic, 380, 383 f., 523
Leclerc, Jean, executed, 448 f.
Lecourt, Étienne, executed, 453
Lee (bishop), 413
Lefèvre d'Etaples, 444 f., 446 f., 449, 451
  De Maria Magdalena, 448
  Doctrines of, 449 note
Legh, 413
Legists in France, 9-12, 32 f.
Leipsic, Debate at, 346
  Papal Bull, 353
Lejay, Claude (Jesuit), 622
  At Council of Trent, 546
Lemos (Dominican), 638
Leo X (pope), 252-260, 582, 595
  Bull *Exsurge Domine,* 352
  Cause of his death, 363 note
  Decree of indulgences, 325
  Excommunication of Luther, 352
  Francis I, 256
  Henry VIII, 393
  Lateran Council, 253
  Luther, 336
  On indulgences, 342
Leo XIII, Constitution *Officiorum,* 582
Leonardo da Vinci, 276, 279
  And Francis I, 441
Lepanto, Battle of, 532
L'Estoile, Pierre de, and Calvin, 461
Leyden, John of (Anabaptist), 382
Leto (*See* Pomponius Laetus)
Liber Sextus, 22, 42
L'Hôpital, Michel de, 479 f., 482
Libero arbitrio, De (by Erasmus), 372
"Libertins," at Geneva, 468
Licet ab initio, Bull, 523 note, 578
Lilio, Luigi (astronomer), 535
Lindau, League of knights, 368
Link, Wenzel, 337
Lippi, Brandolini (preacher), 206
Lippi, Filippino (painter), 275
Lippi, Filippo (painter), 265, 275
Literary culture at Florence, 269-274
Little Book of Eternal Wisdom (by Suso), 291
Liturgical books, to be destroyed, 419
Lives of the Saints (by Surius), 592
Locis theologicis, De (by Melchior Cano), 634
Lollards, 130 f., 391, 394
  And feudalism, 5
Lombard, Peter, 281
  Sentences, 629
"Lords of the Congregation," 435
Lord's Supper (*See* Eucharist)
Lorenzo de' Medici, 200 f., 210, 212, 270, 273, 276 f., 284
  And Savonarola, 213, 278
  Excommunicated, 202
Lorenzo di Credi (painter), 276
  And Savonarola, 278
Lorenzo the Magnificent (*See* Lorenzo de' Medici)
Lorraine, Faber in, 621
Lorraine, Cardinal of, 475 f., 482, 491, 590
Loschi, 267
Louis IX, St. (king of France), 15 f.
  And Templars, 58
  Canonization of, 30
Louis XI (king of France), 199
  Commendatory abbots, 203
  Pragmatic Sanction of Bourges, 194, 197
Louis XII (king of France), 239, 256
  And Julius II, 243 f., 440
  Calling of council, 248
  Council of Pisa, 249
  Council of Tours, 247
  Lateran Council, 253
Louis of Anjou, 121, 138

Louis of Bavaria, 79, 80, 82, 86 f., 91, 95 f.
  And John XXII, 80
  Custody of John XXIII, 150
  Excommunicated, 80
Louise of Savoy, 442, 447 f.
Louvain University, 518
Louvre, 441
Love, Society of Divine, 604
Low Countries (*See* Netherlands)
Loyola (*See* Ignatius)
Luca della Robbia (painter), 275
Lucaris, Cyril (patriarch), 511 note
Lucretia Borgia, 217, 223
  And Giovanni Sforza, 224
  Marries Alfonso of Biseglia, 234
  Regency of papal palace, 234
Luder, Hans, 306, 315
Luder, Martin (*See* Luther)
Ludolph the Carthusian, *Life of Christ,* 613
Ludovico the Moor (*See* Sforza, Ludovico)
Lübeck, Gustavus Vasa at, 509
Lützelburg, House of, 96
Lully, Raymond (missioner), 88
  Writings of, 87 note
Luna, Pedro de (Benedict XIII), 115, 124
Lusiads (by Camoens), 626
Lusignan, Pierre du, preaches crusade, 104
Luther, Martin, 305-386
  Against the Papacy, 384
  Articles of Smalkalden, 383
  Asterisci, 346
  At Altenburg, 343
  At Augsburg, 337 ff.
  At Erfurt, 312
  At Heidelberg, 335
  At Leipsic, 346
  At Mansfeld, 385
  At Rome, 319, 323
  At Wartburg Castle, 362-367
  At Wittenberg, 367
  At Wittenberg University, 322
  At Worms, 359 ff.
  Augustinianism, 320
  Augustinian monk, 313-324
  Bible at Erfurt, 310
  Bigamy of Philip of Hesse, 384
  Brethren of the Common Life, 307
  Burning of papal Bull, 353
  Cajetan, 337 ff.
  Canon of the Bible, 363
  Conference of Marburg, 378
  Death of, 385
  Debate with the devil, 366
  Deutsch Theologia, 295 f., 320
  Diet of Augsburg, 380
  Doctrine of, 318, 322, 329, 374 ff.
  Edict of banishment, 361, 363
  Eisenach, 308
  Erasmus, 334
  Erfurt University, 309 f.
  Eucharist, 374 f.
  Excommunicated, 352
  First of supposed miracles, 359 note
  Good works, Doctrine of, 327
  His writings as sources, 318 note
  Humanists, 330-335
  Hussites, 354
  Indulgences, 327
  Kidnapped, 361
  Lefèvre d'Etaples, 447
  Leo X, 336
  Magdeburg, 307
  Marriage of, 376
  Miltitz, 342-344
  Mutianus, 334
  Mysticism, 320
  Nominalism, 321
  Papal intervention, 335-345
  Parents of, 306
  Peasants' War, 373
  Plague at Nuremberg, 323
  Preacher, 327
  Propositions condemned, 352
  Real Presence, 374
  Reuchlin, 334
  Student, 305-313
  Teaching of John Wesel, 294
  Theses, 328-330
  The theologians, 345-349
  To the German Nobility, 531
  Translation of the Bible, 363, 364 note
  Trebonius, 308
  Truttvetter, 309
  Ursula Cotta, 308
  Vow, 312
  Works of Wessel, 294
Lutheranism in Germany, 350-389
Lyons, Coronation of Clement V at, 50
  Council of, 166
  Council of Pisa, 250 f.

  Father Anger at, 624
  Jesuit college, 624
  Study of Roman law at, 10

Mabillon, Jean (Benedictine), 596
Machiavelli, Political theories, 225
  Il principe, 179, 198
Maderna, Carlo (architect), 267
Madrucci, at Council of Trent, 547
Mahomet II, 185
Magdeburg, Luther at, 307
  Reformation preached at, 369
Magnificent, Lorenzo the (*See* Medici, Lorenzo de')
Maillard, Olivier (Franciscan), 207
Mainardino, Marsiglio (*See* Marsilius of Padua)
Maizières, Philippe de, Western schism, 120
Majella, Monte, and Rienzi, 97
Major, Michel, 575
Majorists, 575
Malatesta, Carlo, 136
Maldonatus, Juan (Jesuit), 577, 624, 634 f.
Malestrout, Suppression of Italian revolt, 108
  Truce of, 95
Malta, 591
Manresa (Spain), 613
Mansfeld, Luther at, 385
Mantegna, Andrea (painter), 276
"Mantellata" (*See* Catherine of Siena)
Mantua, League with Alexander VI, 216
  Pius II at, 191
Maraños, The, 209
Marburg, Conference of, 378
Marcellus II (pope), 525
Marche, Jacques de la (Franciscan), 207
Marcus Eugenicus, Council of Ferrara, 168
  Council of Florence, 169
Mare magnum, Bull, 202, 204, 254
Margaret (queen of Denmark), 507
Margaret, queen of Navarre (Margaret d'Angoulême), 442, 446, 451, 464, 485
  And Calvin, 465
  Heptameron, 443
  Marriage to Henry of Navarre, 486
  Miroir de l'âme pécheresse, 453
Margaret of Hungary, St., 113
Margaret of Parma, 503
Margaret of Valois (*See* Margaret d'Angoulême)
Maria Magdalena (by Lefèvre), 448
Mariano (Franciscan), 212, 228
Marignano, French victory at, 256
Marigny, Philip de (archbishop), and Templars, 63
Mark of Ephesus, Council of Ferrara, 168
  Council of Florence, 169, 171
Marot, Clement (poet), 451 f.
  And Francis I, 441
Maronites, Council of Basle, 167
Marseilles, Francis I and Clement VII at, 453
  Possevin at, 624
Marseilles, Bishop of, and lay usurpation, 25
Marsilio Ficino (*See* Ficino)
Marsilius of Padua (theologian), 48, 82 ff., 86 f., 140
Martène, Edmond (Benedictine), 596
Martin V (pope), 153-158, 391
  Acknowledged by John XXIII, 150
  At Florence, 155
  Bernardine of Siena, St., 157
  Concordats, 154
  Elected by Council of Constance, 151
  Nepotism, 155, 158
  Periodic councils, 154
  Restoration of Rome, 155
  Works in Rome, 155 note
Martinists, 389
Martyrology, Protestant, 457 note
  Roman, Revision of, 535
Mary (queen of England), 422, 423-428, 577
  Accession, 423
  Bloody repression, 424 f.
  Charles V, 424
  Courtenay, 425
  Executions for heresy, 427
  Ireland, 426
  Jane Grey, 423
  Mass, 420
  Number of executions by, 428 note
  Paul IV, 428
  Policy of conciliation, 423
  Reconciliation of England with Rome, 425

Mary Stuart (queen of Scots), 433, 577
  Attack by Knox, 435
  Execution, 434
  Pius V and, 533
Mary, Immaculate Conception of, at Council of Trent, 552
Masaccio (painter), and Eugene IV, 264
Mass (*See* Eucharist)
Massacre of Nîmes, 485
Massacre of the Vaudois, 455-458
Massarelli, at Council of Trent, 571
Matrimony, at Council of Trent, 563
Matthiessen (*See* Matthys)
Matthys, John 382, 501
Maubuisson, Abbey of, 58
Mauleon, Miramonde de, at Avignon, 110
Mauriac, Jesuit college, 623
Maurice of Saxony, 560
Maximilian I (emperor), 299, 302, 336, 355, 591
  Calling of council, 248
  Council of Pisa, 249
  Jewish books, 331
  Threat of Pragmatic Sanction, 247
Mayence, Archbishop of, 325
Maynier, Jean (magistrate), 456 f.
"Meaux, Cenacle of," 445 ff.
  Slaughter of Huguenots, 489
Mechtilde, St., 113
Medici, family, 270
  Conspiracy of the Pazzi, 200
  Catherine de', 453, 479 ff., 484 f., 521, 591; Council of Trent, 548, 574; St. Bartholomew's Day, 487 f., 490
  Cosimo de', 265, 270
  Giovanni de' (Leo X), 210, 252, 273
  Giuliano de', Assassination of, 201
  Julius de' (Clement VII), 518
  Lorenzo de', 200 f., 210, 212, 270, 273, 276 f., 284; and Savonarola, 213, 278; excommunicated, 202
  Piero de', 219
Medieval institutions, Decline of, 3-8
Meissen, Bishop of, Indulgences, 326
Melanchthon, 324, 338, 348, 454, 471, 575
  Abandons Luther, 372
  Bigamy of Philip of Hesse, 384
  Diet of Augsburg, 373, 378
  Greek Church, 511
  Henry VIII, 412
Memmi, Simone (painter), 261
Mende, Durandus, bishop of, and Council of Vienne, 90
Mendicant Orders, Lateran Council, 254
  Popularity of, 204
Mendicité spirituelle, 129
Mennonites, 575
Menot, Michel (Franciscan), 207
Mercananzia, Court of the, 226
Mercurian, Everard (Jesuit), 619
Méré, Poltrot de (assassin), 485
Merici, St. Angela de', 607, 610
Mérindol, Massacre of, 455 ff.
Mervel, Godefried of (martyr), 506
Messina, Antonello da (painter), 276
Metz, Father Anger at, 624
  Siege of, 478
  Bishop of, and Boniface VIII, 25
Michael of Cesena (Franciscan), 82, 91
Michael Palaeologus (emperor), 167
Michaelis (Dominican), 596
Michelangelo (artist), 279
  And Julius II, 244
  Masterpieces of, 280 note
Michelotto (assassin), 218, 234
Middle Ages, Decline of institutions of, 3-8
  Papacy in the, 3
Milan, Council of Pisa, 250
  French war against, 256
  League with Alexander VI, 216
  Pestilence at, 586
  Rebellion, 107
Milne, Walter, executed, 436
Miltitz, Karl von, 342-344, 349
  And Luther, 342 ff.
Minard (magistrate), 475 f.
Minims, Order of, 202
  Popularity of, 204
Miramonde de Mauleon, at Avignon, 110
Mirandola, Julius II at, 244
Mirandola, Pico della (philosopher), 271
  And Cajetan, 250
  Errors condemned, 209
  Heresy of, 271 note
  Politian and, 273 note
  Savonarola, 278
  Theses condemned, 271

Miroir de l'âme pécheresse (by Margaret d'Angoulême), 453
Misères du temps (by Ronsard), 482
Missal, Revision of the, 532
Mitylene, Crusade victory at, 188
Mohacs, Battle of, 522
Möhra (Thuringia), 306
Molay, Jacques de (Templar), 58, 61, 66
  Death of, 67
Molina, Luis de (Jesuit), 630, 636 f.
  Concord of Free Will with the Gifts of Grace, 636
Molinism, 636
Monarchical absolutism in France, 5
Monasteries, Abuses in, 570
  Benedictine, 202 ff.
  Decline of, 594
  Destruction of English, 411, 413 f.
  Exemptions, 202
  Suppression of English, 400 f.
Monsieur, Peace of, 491
Montaigu College, 461
Montauban, Huguenot refuge, 485
Monte, Del (Julius III), 524
  Council of Trent, 545
Monteaux, Clement V at, 68
Montebello, Marquis of, 529
Monte Falco (monastery), 595
Montfaucon (Benedictine), 596
Montepulciano, Strada at, 620
Montmartre, Church of, 614
Montmorency, 481, 483
Montpellier (France), 112, 499
  Pedro de Luna at, 125
  Study of Roman law at, 10
Montserrat (Spain), 613
Moravian Brethren, 149
More, Blessed Thomas, 392, 406, 408 f.
  Resigns as chancellor, 402
  Utopia, 392
Morigia, Jacopo (Theatine), 606
Morone, Giovanni (card.), 578, 615
  Council of Trent, 562, 567
Mount Carmel, Order of, 597 ff.
Mühldorf, Battle of, 80
Müller, Johann (astronomer), 302
Münster, Anabaptists at, 381 f.
Murner, Thomas, 355
Murrone, Pietro di (Celestine V), 100
Music, Church, 627 ff.
Musso, Cornelius, at Council of Trent, 547
Mutianus, Konrad, 305, 309, 333
  And Luther, 334
Myconius, Frederick, 368
  And Spalatin, 330
Mysticism, of Luther, 320
  Renaissance, 287-296
  Saint Teresa, 642 ff.

Nantes, Edict of, 438, 498 ff.
Narbonne, Archbishop of, 36
Nassau, William of, 502 ff.
Navarre, College of, 453
  Gregory XI and, 111
Negropont, Battle of, 88
  Fall of, 196
Nelli, Sister Plautilla (artist), 280
Nelson, Blessed John, 433
Neoplatonism, 283 f.
Neoaristotelianism, 284
Nérac, Calvin at, 465
Neri, St. Philip (*See* Philip)
Netherlands, Jesuits in, 621
  Protestantism in, 501 ff.
  Spanish Inquisition, 501
Newgate, Martyrs at, 406
"New Sion," Kingdom of, 382
New Testament, Commentary on (by Erasmus), 302, 305
Nicholas III (pope), and the Franciscans, 74
  Bull *Exiit qui seminat,* 74
Nicholas IV (pope), Olivi's disciples, 75
  Templars, 58
Nicholas V (pope), 180-185
  Bull *Cum multa,* 597
  Humanism, 183
  St. John Capistran, 182
Nicholas d'Abergati, and Martin V, 157
Nicholas of Cusa (card.), 182, 201, 283
  Council of Basle, 162, 164, 172
  De concordia catholica, 162
  Doctrine, 285 f.
  Papal authority, 154
  Reform project, 192
Nieheim, Dietrich von, 120
Nigliorati, Cosmato (Innocent VII), 124 note
Nîmes, Massacre of, 485
Nobility in France, 6, 439
Nocera, Urban VI besieged at, 121
Nogaret, William of (legist), 14
  Anagni outrage, 39 ff.

  Benedict XI, 45
  Clement V, 54
  Excommunicated, 45
  Templars, 58
Nominalism, Luther and, 321
Norway, Union with Denmark and Sweden, 508
  Western schism, 120
Notre Dame, Congregation of, 596
Notre Dame des Doms (Avignon), 261
Noyon (France), 438, 459
Nuremberg (Germany), 86
  Diet of, 80, 370, 383, 520
  Martinians in control of, 369
  Osiander at, 368
  Peace of, 381
  Plague at, 323

Oath of succession (in England), 406
Oath of supremacy, Queen Elizabeth, 431
Oath of Supremacy, Henry VIII, 406
Obelisci (by Eck), 345
Oblates, Congregation of the, 585
Obligations, Traité des (by Pothier), 475
Occam, William, 48, 81 f., 91, 96, 140
  Doctrine, 284
Occitaine Congregation (Dominicans), 596
Ochino, Bernardino, 418, 511, 595, 620
Odoric de Pordenone (missioner), 88
Oecolampadius, Johann (theologian), 348 f., 455
  Sacramentary dispute, 374
Officiorum (Constitution), 582
Olivi, Peter John (Franciscan), 74 ff.
Olmütz, College at, 534
Oppède, Baron d' (Jean Maynier), 456 f.
Orange, William of, 502 ff.
Oratory, Congregation of the, 532, 590, 595, 607 f.
Oratory of Divine Love, 595
Orcagna, Andrea (painter), 266
Ordeal of fire, Savonarola, 230 f.
Order of Discalced Augustinians, 202
Order of Minims, 202
Order of the Humiliati, 585
Orders, Anglican, 421, 430
Orders, Decline of Religious, 594
Ordinal of Edward VI, 421, 430
Original sin, Council of Trent, 550 f.
Orsini, 180
  And Alexander VI, 221
  And Colonna, 46, 93
  And Pius III, 241
Orsini (card.), and Election of Urban VI, 116
  Matteo Rosso dei, 50 f.
Orvieto, Clement VII at, 397
Osiander, Andreas, 369
  And Albrecht of Brandenburg, 370
  At Nuremberg, 368
  Sacramentary dispute, 373
Osiandrists, 575
Ossa, Jacques d' (John XXII), 78
Otto, Blessed, 113
Otto IV, count of Flanders, and Philip the Fair, 24
Our Lady of Victory, Feast instituted, 532
Oxford, Executions at, 427
  Reform school, 392
  University, 88; Peter Martyr at, 418; Western schism, 135

Pacification of Ghent, 506
Padua University, 284
  Henry VIII's divorce, 400
Painting, Renaissance, 275 f.
Palaeologus, John (emperor), abjures schism, 104
  Michael (emperor), Greek Church, 167
Palatinate, 299
Palestrina, 627, 629
Palliano, Duke of, executed, 529
Palmer, Thomas, executed, 423
Pamiers, Jesuit college at, 623
Pampeluna (Spain), 613
Pandects, 9, 22
Papa romano, De (by Wyclif), 130
Papacy and Empire, 4
  Italianization of, 246
  Power of, 245-247
Papal authority, 127 ff.
  At Council of Basle, 162
  Jean Gerson and, 122
  In England, 403
  Pierre d'Ailly and, 122
Papal elections, 114
Papal intervention, and Luther, 335

Papal supremacy, Boniface VIII and, 30 ff.
  Bull *Unam sanctam,* 38
  Philip the Fair and, 30 ff.
Paracelsus, 388
Parentucelli, Tommaso (Nicholas V), 181
Paris, Collège de Clermont, 624
  Father Anger at, 624
  Trial of Templars, 61, 63
Paris University, 13, 83, 88, 91, 463 f., 613
  Boniface VIII and, 20 f.
  Gerson, 129
  Jesuits, 624
  Pragmatic Sanction, 197
  Western schism, 125 ff., 135
Parker, Matthew (archbishop), 430
Parliament (English), Annates, 402
  Heresy laws, 427
Parliament (French), 499
  Edict of Nantes, 499
  Heretics, 450, 452
  Jesuits, 623
  Nicholas Cop, 464
  Protestantism, 443
Parma, Jesuits in, 620
  John of, Idealism, 122
Parr, Catherine, 413
Parsons, Robert (*See* Persons)
Pascal, St. Peter, 113
Paul II (pope), 195-197, 269
  Crusade project, 196
  Roman Academy, 272
Paul III (pope), 382, 522-524, 615
  Barnabites, 606
  Bull *Licet ab initio,* 523 note, 578
  Children of, 524 note
  Constitution *Regimini militantis,* 615
  Council of Trent, 543 f.
  Interdicts Henry VIII, 411
  Letter to Francis I, 454
  Monasteries and, 595
  More and Fisher, 408 f.
  Nepotism, 524
  Plans interdict of England, 410
  Somaschi, 606
  Ursulines, 610
Paul IV (pope), 474, 525-528, 580
  Elizabeth, 430
  Henry II, 474
  Index, 523 note
  Inquisition, 527, 578
  Ireland, 426
  Jesuits, 619
  Nepotism, 526
  Philip II, 526
  Protestantism in Spain, 511
  Queen Mary, 428
  Reconvokes Council of Trent, 561
  Reform measures, 527
Paul V (pope), Constitution *Quantum religio,* 620
  Jesuits and Dominicans, 638
Pavannes, Jacques, 446
  Executed, 449
Pavia, Council at, 156
  List of prelates, 156 note
Pazzi, Conspiracy of the, 200
Peace of Augsburg, 386
  Of Crespy, 544
  Of Monsieur, 491
  Of Nuremberg, 381
  Of Saint-Germain, 485
Peasants' War, 373
Pedro de Luna (Benedict XIII), 124
Peking, Bishopric of, 88
Pelayo, Alvaro, 87, 90
Pellicanus, Conrad (theologian), 368
Penance, Sacrament of, at Council of Trent, 559
Penitents, Confraternity of Black, 609
Pensicola (fortress), Benedict XIII at, 151
Peraudi, Raimond (card.), 217
Peretti, Felice (Sixtus V), 538
Péronne (France), 491
Perron, Cardinal du, and Henry of Navarre, 496
Persons, Robert (Jesuit), 434
Perugia, Benedict XI goes to, 47
  Rebellion, 107
Perugino (painter), 265
Peter Arbues, St., Assassination of, 209
Peter Armengol, St., 113
Peter Fourier, St., 596
Peter Canisius, St., 624
  Beatified, 624 note
  Peter Canisius Society, 501 note
Peter Lombard (theologian), 281
  Sentences, 629
Peter Martyr (Vermigli), 418, 423, 482, 511
Peter of Aragon (Blessed), Western schism, 120, 132

Peter of Luxemburg (Blessed), Western schism, 120, 132 f.
Peter Pascal, St., 113
Peter the Cruel, and Card. Albornoz, 101
Peter Thomas (Blessed), sets out on crusade, 104
Peter's pence, abolished in England, 403
Peterson (*See* Petri)
Petrarch, Francesco (poet), 261-264
  Benedict XII, 264
  Bibliophile, 262
  Canzoniere, 262
  Clement VI, 264
  De contemptu mundi, 263
  Praise of Urban V, 103
  Rienzi, 97
Petri, Lars, 509
  Olaf, 509
Peutinger, Conrad (humanist), 302
Pfefferkorn, Johann, *Handspiegel,* 332
  Jewish writings, 331
Pfeffinger, 575
Philargis, Pierre (Alexander V), 137
Philip II (king of Spain), 434, 483, 565, 580 f., 591
  Council of Trent, 562, 567, 574
  Inquisition, 533
  Jesuits, 620
  Netherlands, 503 f.
  Paul IV and, 526
  Pius V and, 533
  Queen Mary, 428
Philip III (the Bold), king of France, 17
Philip IV (the Fair), king of France, 13 ff.
  Builds tower opposite Avignon, 52
  Bull *Ausculta fili,* 35
  Bull *Clericis laicos,* 28
  Clement V, 70
  Council of Vienne, 65
  Debasing of coinage, 24
  Defeat at Courtrai, 37
  Legists, 9-12, 32
  Letter from Benedict XI, 44
  Letter from Boniface VIII, 23, 24, 28 f.
  Letter from Clement V, 59
  Letter to Clement V, 55
  Mansiones et itinera, 50 note
  National policy of, 13-19
  Papal supremacy, 30 ff.
  Pretended letter to Boniface VIII, 35
  Ranke's estimate of, 16
  States General of 1302, 36
  Templars, 58 ff.
Philip Neri, St., 538, 591, 607
  Esteem for Savonarola, 233
  Pius V and, 592
Philip, landgrave of Hesse, 377 f.
  Bigamy of, 384
Philip of Valois, 91
Philippe de Commines (historian), 219
Philippe de Maizières, Western schism, 120
Philosophy, Renaissance, 281
  Scholastic, 281
Piccinino, 190
Piccolomini, Eneas (Pius II), 189
  Concordat with Germany, 174
  Council of Basle, 162, 172
  Papal authority, 154
Piccolomini, Francesco (Pius III), 239
Pico della Mirandola (*See* Mirandola)
Pieck, Nicholas (martyr), 506
Pierluigi, Giovanni (Palestrina), 628 f.
Piero de' Medici, 219
Pierre du Lusignan, preaches a crusade, 104
Pietism, Individualistic, 387-389
Pietro della Francesca (painter), 265 f.
Pietro di Murrone (Celestine V), 100
Pietro of Corbario (antipope), 86, 88
Pighius (theologian), 553
Pignotte, The, 91 note
Pilgrimage of Grace, 411, 413
Pious Schools, Congregation of, 610
Pious Workers, 607
Pisa (Italy), 9, 82
  Council of, 136 f., 140, 249-251; Deposition of pope, 137; Ecumenicity, 136; Gerson, 129
Pisanello, Victor (painter), 264 f.
Pisseleu, Anne de, 443
Pitti palace, 266
Pius II (pope), 189-195, 269
  At Ferrara, 210
  Bull *Vocavit nos Pius,* 191
  Crusade, 191, 194
  Humanism, 193
  Reform measures, 192
Pius III (pope), 239-241

Pius IV (pope), 528-530, 571, 584 f.
  Bull *Benedictus Deus,* 530
  Index, 582
  Music, 628
  Nepotism, 584 note
  Palestrina, 629
  Somaschi, 607
Pius V, St. (pope), 432, 504, 530-534, 582, 591 f., 596
  American Indians, 533
  Brothers of St. John of God, 607
  Bull *Regnans Dei,* 433
  Charles IX, 486, 532
  Excommunication of Queen Elizabeth, 433
  Iniquisition, 533, 578
  Mary Stuart, 533
  Jesuits, 619
  Philip II, 533
  Protestants, 486
  St. Thomas Aquinas, 629
  Somaschi, 607
Pius X (pope), Bull *Sapienti consilio,* 269 note
Plain chant, 628
Palisians, Guillaume de (legist), 40, 53
Platina, Bartolommeo, 197
Plato and Platonism, 274, 284, 285
Plautilla Nelli, Sister (artist), 280
Plethon, Gemistus (philosopher), 270, 277
Plotinus, 285
Poggio, Giovanni (humanist), 268, 274
  At papal court, 124
  Council of Constance, 157
  Facetiae, 179, 183, 268 f.
Poissy, Colloquy of, 482
Poitiers, Conference of Clement V at, 52
Poland, Protestantism in, 511
  Western schism, 120
Pole, Reginald (card.), 523, 578, 590
  Council of Trent, 545
  Henry VIII, 410
  Paul IV, 428
  Queen Mary, 427
  Reconciliation of England with Rome, 425
  Unity of the Church, 410
Politian, Angiolo (humanist), 271 ff.
  And Pico della Mirandola, 273 note
Political authority, Doctrine of, 84
Pollich, Martin, and Luther, 322
Polomar, John of, and Council of Basle, 260
Poltrot de Méré (assassin), 485
Pomerania, Lutheranism in, 370
  Duke of, 370
Pomponazzi, Pietro, Aristotelianism, 283
  De immortalitate animae, 284
Pomponius Laetus (humanist), 197, 271 f.
Pont-à-Mousson, University of, 624
"Pontefice Terribile," 242
"Poor priests," 129 f.
Poor-tax in England, 415
Pope, Primacy of, Council of Florence, 170
Popes:
  Celestine V (1294), 19 f.
  Boniface VIII (1294-1303), 19-42
  Benedict XI (1303-04), 42-46
  Clement V (1305-14), 49-71
  John XXII (1316-34), 78-92
  Benedict XII (1334-42), 92-95
  Clement VI (1342-52), 95-99
  Innocent VI (1352-62), 99-103
  Urban V (1362-70), 103-106
  Gregory XI (1370-78), 106-112
  Urban VI (1378-89), 114-123
  (Clement VII, 1378-94), 123
  Boniface IX (1389-1404), 123
  (Benedict XIII, 1394-1424), 124-131
  Innocent VII (1404-06), 123 f.
  Gregory XII (1406-15), 123 f.
  Alexander V (1409-10), 138 f.
  John XXIII (1410-15), 139-141
  Martin V (1417-31), 153-158
  (Clement VIII, 1424-29), 151
  (Benedict XIV, 1424), 151
  Eugene IV (1431-47), 159-177
  (Felix V, 1439-49), 172
  Nicholas V (1447-55), 180-185
  Callistus III (1455-58), 185-188
  Pius II (1458-64), 189-195
  Paul II (1464-71), 195-197
  Sixtus IV (1471-84), 197-207
  Innocent VIII (1484-92), 208, 213
  Alexander VI (1492-1503), 214-237
  Pius III (1503), 239-241
  Julius II (1503-13), 241-252
  Leo X (1513-21), 252-260
  Adrian VI (1522-23), 518-520
  Clement VII (1523-34), 520-522
  Paul III (1534-49), 522-524

- Julius III (1550-55), 524
- Marcellus II (1555), 525
- Paul IV (1555-59), 525-528
- Pius IV (1559-65), 528-530
- Pius V (1566-72), 530-534
- Gregory XIII (1572-85), 534-537
- Sixtus V (1585-90), 537-540
- Urban VII (1590), 540
- Gregory XIV (1590-91), 540
- Innocent IX (1591), 540
- Clement VIII (1592-1605), 540

Popes, Worldliness of the, 152
Porcaro, Stefano (card.), 184
Pordenone, Odoric de (missioner), 88
Portugal, Jesuits in, 621
  Templars in, 64
Possevin, Antony (Jesuit), 624
Postel, Guillaume (orientalist), 445
Pothier, Robert, *Traité des obligations,* 475
Potken, Adam, 301, 345 note
Pouet (bishop), 419
Poverty, Doctrine of, 81
  Of city workers, 7
"Praemunire," 399 note
  Bill of, and Cardinal Wolsey, 399
Praise of Folly (by Erasmus), 392
Pragmatic Sanction of Bourges, 172-174, 190, 194, 257, 260, 440,
  Abolition of, 253
Prague, College at, 534
  Compactata of, 166
Prato, Arlotto da (Franciscan), and Olivi, 75
Preaching (15th century), 205
Predestination, Thomas Bradwardine on, 295
Premonstratensians, 596
Prignano, Bartolommeo (Urban VI), 114 f.
Primacy of the pope, at Council of Florence, 170
Primaticcio, and Francis I, 441
"Princes' Concordat," 175
Principe, Il (by Machiavelli), 179, 198
Procession of Holy Ghost, Council of Ferrara, 168
  Council of Florence, 169
Prospeculum (by Wyclif), 130
"Protestant," Origin of, 378
Provence, Trial of Templars in, 63
Prussia, Origin of Duchy of, 371
Puglia, Francesco, and ordeal of fire, 231
Pulci (poet), 276
Puritanism in Scotland, 435 ff.
  Elizabeth's alliance with, 436
Purgatory, at Council of Florence, 170

Quantum religio, Constitution, 620
Quoniam alto, Bull, 160

Rainalducci, Pietro (antipope), 86-88
Raphael (painter), and Julius II, 244
  And Savonarola, 278
Ratisbon, Diet of, 383
  Interim, 383
Ravaillac, 500
Raymond de Turenne, Suppression of Italian revolt, 108
Raymond of Capua, and St. Catherine, 109
Re aedificatoria, De (by Alberti), 267
Reading, Abbey of, 414
Real Presence, Calvin's doctrine on, 368 note
  In Anglican Church, 418
Recess of Vasteras, 510
Redemption, Lutheran theory of, 321 note
Reformation, Economic causes, 300 note
Réforme de la théologie, 129
"Regale," Privilege of, 19
Regimini militantis (Constitution), 615
Regnans Dei, Bull, 433
Regola del governo di cura familiare (by Dominici), 180
Regola di vita cristiana, 180
Regular Clerics of St. Mayeul, 606
Regular Clerics of St. Paul, 606
Reinhard, Martin (Reformer), 508
Religione christiana, De (by Ficino), 285
Religious Orders, Decline of, 594
Renaissance, German, 299-305
  Intellectual evolution of, 261
  Papacy and, 296 note
Renaudie, La, executed, 481
René of Anjou, 191
Reni, Guido (painter), 627
Requesens, Luis of, 506
Residence, Episcopal, at Council of Trent, 566 f.
Restitutio Christiana (by Servet), 471

Reuchlin, Johann (humanist), 302, 323
  Abandons Luther, 372
  And Luther, 334
  Augenspiegel, 332
  De accentibus et orthographis linguae hebraicae, 302
  De rudimentis hebraicis, 302
  Jewish books, 331
Revolutionary spirit in France, 6-8
Rex gloriae, Bull, 55, 56 note
Reynolds, Richard (Brigittine martyr), 407
Rheims, Father Anger at, 624
  Seminary founded, 590
  University, 478
Rhodes, 519
Riario, Girolamo (card.), 201, 208
  Pietro (card.), 198 f.
  Raffaele (card.), 208
Ribadeneira, Pedro (Jesuit), 616
Ridley, Nicholas (bishop), 422
  Forty-two Articles, 421
Rienzi, Cola di, 97-101
Robbia, Luca della (artist), 275
Robert, Archbishop of Canterbury, 28
  King of Naples, 79 f.
  Of Anjou, 69
  Of Geneva (Clement VII), 115, 119, 124; his break with Urban VI, 118; election of Urban VI, 117; revolt in Italy, 108
  The Good, and the Templars, 63
Roberto of Lecce (Franciscan), 207
Roch, St., 48, 112
Rochelle, La (France), 485, 499
Rochetaille, de la (card.), Council of Basle, 162
Rodriguez, Simon (Jesuit), 614
  In Portugal, 621
Roger, Pierre (Clement VI), 95
  Pierre de Beaufort (Gregory XI), 107
Rohrbach, Berthold de, Mysticism, 292 f.
Roman Academy, and Paul III, 197
  Dissolution of, 272
Roman Catechism, 585
Roman College, 534, 590
Roman Inquisition, 577 f.
  Use of torture, 578
Roman law, 11, 22
  Study of, 9-11, 21
Roman Martyrology, Revision of, 535
Roman University, Restoration of, 124
Rome, Arrival of Urban V at, 103
  Colleges founded by Gregory XIII at, 534
  Colonna, 43
  Colonna and Orsini, 46
  Greek College, 535
  Gregory XI goes to, 112
  Guelfs and Ghibellines in, 23
  Luther at, 319, 323
  Pillage by Ladislas, 140
  Restoration by Martin V, 155
  Rienzi, 101
  St. Ignatius at, 615
Ronsard, *Les misères du temps,* 482
Rosary, Confraternity of, 592
  Feast of the, 532
Rose, Thomas, 426
Rose of Viterbo, St., 109
Roseline of Villeneuve, St., 48, 112
Rouen, Seminary founded, 590
  Slaughter of Huguenots, 489
Roussel, Gerard, 445 f., 449, 451, 464
Rovere, Francesco della (Sixtus IV), 198
  Giuliano della (Julius II), 199, 208, 239, 241; Alliance with Charles VIII, 218; and Alexander VI, 220
Royal authority, 12
Royal power in France, 440 f.
"Royal safeguard," 19
Royalty, Ideal of, 12
Rubianus, Crotus, 359
  Epistolae obscurorum virorum, 332
Rudolph, king of the Romans, 21
  And Philip the Fair, 24
Rudolph of Habsburg, 4
Rudolph von Langen (humanist), 330
Ruinart, Thierry (Benedictine), 596
Rule of faith, Council of Trent, 548 f.
Ruysbroeck, Blessed John, Mysticism, 290

Sachs, Hans (poet), 323, 368
Sachsenhausen, 80
Sacramentary dispute, 373-376
Sacraments, at Council of Trent, 555, 557 ff.
  Efficacy of, 293
Sadoleto, Jacopo (card.), 523, 603, 615
"Safeguard, Royal," 19
Saint-André, Jacques, 483

Saint Andrew's cathedral (Scotland), 436
Saint Bartholomew's Day, 484 ff.
  Number of the slain, 489 note.
Saint-Denis, Abbey of, 203
Saint-Germain, Peace of, 485
Saint-Germain-en-Laye, 482
Saint John of God, Brothers of, 607
St. John of Jerusalem, Knights of (*See* Hospitallers)
Saint Just, Monastery of, 561, 579
Saint-Martin, Claude de, 388
Saint-Maur, Congregation of, 596
Saint Mayeul, Regular Clerics of, 606
Saint-Michel, Trinitarians at, 596
Saint Paul, Regular Clerics of, 606
St. Peter's basilica, and Alberti, 266
  Doors of, 266 note
  Nicholas V, 266
  Sixtus V, 539
Saint Sauveur, Congregation of, 596
Saint-Vanne, Abbey of, 596
  Benedictine reform, 595
  Congregation of, 596
Saint Victor of Marseilles (abbey), 103
Saintonge, Calvin at, 464
Saints, Destruction of images of, 419
Saisset, Bernard (bishop), 33 f.
Salamanca, Jesuits at, 621
  University, 88, 547, 613, 637
Salic law, 492
Salmeron, Council of Trent, 546, 557
Salutati, Coluccio (humanist), 262
Salvator mundi, Bull, 34
Samtre, William, executed, 130
Sanction of Bourges, Pragmatic, 172-175, 190, 194
Sanders, and English Catholics, 432
Sanseverino, Giulio (*See* Pomponius Laetus)
Sant' Angelo, Castel, 114, 184
Sanudo, Marino, 88
Sapienti consilio, Bull, 269 note
Saumur, Huguenots at, 499
Saunier (Reformer), at Geneva, 468
Sauveur, Congregation of Saint, 596
Savonarola, Girolamo, 152, 180, 207, 211 ff., 225 ff., 229, 233
  Alexander VI, 229 f.
  Apologetics, 287 f.
  At Florence, 211
  At Siena, 220
  Botticelli, 278
  Charles VIII, 219 f.
  Contempt for the World, 211
  Decline of the Church, 211
  Donatello, 278
  Execution of, 232
  Influence on art, 277 f.
  Lorenzo de' Medici, 278
  Lorenzo di Credi, 278
  Ordeal of fire, 230 f.
  Pico della Mirandola, 278
  Political theories, 226
  Preaching of, 212 f.
  Raphael, 278
  St. Catherine de Ricci, 233
  St. Philip Neri, 233
  Simone Cronaca, 278
  Trial of, 232
  Triumphus crucis, 287 f.
Saxony, 299
  Anabaptists, 382
Scanderbeg, 175, 188, 194, 196
Scandinavian countries, Protestantism in, 507 ff.
Schaffhausen, John XXIII at, 145
Schamburg, Sylvester von, and Luther, 351
Scheurl, Christopher (Reformer), 323
Schism, Greek, abjured by John Palaeologus, 104
Schism, Western, Beginning of, 119
  Blessed Peter of Aragon, 120, 132
  Blessed Peter of Luxemburg, 120, 132 f.
  Bologna University, 135
  Charles VI, king of France, 126
  Conrad of Gelnhausen, 120, 127
  Denmark, 120
  Dietrich von Nieheim, 120
  End of, 149 ff.
  England, 120, 402 ff.
  Feudalism, 4
  France, 120
  Geoffrey de Boucicaut, 127
  Germany, 120
  Henry of Langenstein, 120, 128
  Hungary, 120
  Italy, 120
  Norway, 120
  Not a real schism, 120 note
  Oxford University, 135
  Paris University, 125 ff.
  Philippe de Maizières, 120
  Pierre d'Ailly, 120, 126 f.

Poland, 120
St. Catherine of Siena, 120, 131
St. Catherine of Sweden, 120
St. Colette, 120, 132
St. Vincent Ferrer, 120, 127, 132 f.
Scotland, 120
Spain, 120
Sweden, 120
Wenceslaus, king of the Romans, 126
Scholasticism, 281
Council of Trent and, 572 note
Decadence of, 283
Schools, Congregation of Pious, 610
Schools, Jesuit, 622 ff.
Schwarzenberg, John of, and Council of Florence, 169
Schwarzerd, Philip (Melanchthon), 347 note
Schwenkfeld, Caspar, 387, 575
Scotland, Puritanism in, 435
Western schism, 120
Scripture as rule of faith, at Council of Trent, 548 f.
Scripture, and canon of, at Council of Trent, 550
Editions of, 303
Sculpture, Renaissance, 275
Sebastian, St., painting by Baccio, 212
Secular Clerics of Christian Doctrine, 609
Sedan, Maldonatus at, 624
Semblançay (archbishop), 439
Seminaries, Council of Trent, 568
St. Charles Borromeo, 586 ff.
Sendomiriensis, Consensus, 511
Sentences (by Peter Lombard), 629
Servet, Michel, 575
Restitutio Christiana, 471
Servites, Popularity of, 205
Seymour, Anne, 413
Seymour, duke of Somerset, 416
Seville, Auto da fè at, 580 f.
Sforza, Ascanio (card.), 208, 210
Francesco, 163
Galeazzo Maria, Assassination of, 200 f.
Giovanni, and Lucrezia Borgia, 224
Ludovico, 207; and Charles VIII, 216; league with Alexander VI, 221
Shaxton (bishop), 413
Sherwood, Thomas (martyr), 433
Sickingen, Franz von, 351, 354, 356, 358, 361, 371 f.
League of knights, 368
Siena, Council of, 156
Savonarola at, 220
Sigault, Vincent, Council of Pisa, 250
Siger of Brabant, 14
Sigismond (emperor) and John XXIII, 141, 145
Signorelli (painter), 265, 276
Silvester de Budes, and suppression of Italian revolt, 108
Simone Cronaca and Savonarola, 278
Simons, Menno, and the Mennonites, 575
Sin, Original, at Council of Trent, 550 f.
Sion, Abbey of, 404
Martyrs, 406
Sistine Choir, 202
Six Articles (Anglican Church), 412
Sixtus IV (pope), 197-207
Assassination of Giuliano de' Medici, 201
Bull *Mare magnum,* 202, 204
College of Abbreviators, 269
Crusade, 199
Golden Bull, 202
Humanism, 198
Nepotism, 198
Spanish Inquisition, 199
Sixtus V (pope), 537-540, 596
Camillians, 608
College of Cardinals, 539
Congregation of the Council, 539
Congregation of the Index, 539
Constitution *Immensa aeterni Dei,* 578
Henry of Navarre, 494
Jesuits, 620
St. Peter's basilica, 539
Vulgate, 539
Smalkalden, Articles of (by Luther), 383
Smalkaldic League, 380, 383 f., 523
Society of Jesus (*See* Jesuits)
Socinians, 575
Soliman, Siege of Vienna, 378
Somaschi, 522, 595, 606
Somerset, Duke of, 416, 419
Sorbonne, and heresies, 447
And heretics, 450

  Henry VIII's divorce, 400
  Margaret d'Angoulême, 453
  Protestantism, 443
Sorcery, Practice of, 209
Soreth, Blessed John, 597
Soto, Dominic, 629
  At Council of Trent, 547
Soul, the "form" of the body, 76
Sovereignty, Doctrine of political, 84
Spain, Concordat of Martin V, 154
  League with Alexander VI, 221
  League with Julius II, 248
  Protestantism in, 511
  Western schism, 120
Spalatin, George (Reformer), 309, 323, 340 ff.
Spanish Armada, 434
Spanish Inquisition, 511, 579 ff.
  In the Netherlands, 501
  Sixtus IV, 199
Spener, Philip (poet), 387
Spenlein, and Luther, 322
Spires, Decree of, 378
"Spiritual" Brethren, 74, 81 ff., 96
Spiritual Exercises (by St. Ignatius), 613, 639 ff.
State, Church and, 85
States General (1302), 36; (1484), 7; of Blois, 494
States of the Church, 244
Statues of saints, Destruction of, 419
Staupitz, Johann, 315 f., 319, 322 f., 326, 339, 342, 372
Stimulus pastorum (by Bartholomew a Martyribus), 591
Strada, Francesco (Jesuit), 620
Strasburg, 449
  Calvin at, 465
Stuart, Mary, and Pius V, 533
Styria, 576
Suarez, Francisco (Jesuit), 630, 637
  Congruism, 630
  Disputationes metaphysicae, 630
Succession, Oath of (in England), 406
Suffolk, Duke of, executed, 425
Sulpice, Congregation of St., 590
Summa theologica of St. Antoninus, 193
  Of St. Thomas Aquinas, 281, 629;
  At Council of Trent, 546
Summi Magistri, Bull, 203 note
Super Petri solio, Bull, 40
Supremacy, Oath of (in England), 406
  Elizabeth, 431
"Supreme head of the Church," 400
Surius, Laurent, *Lives of the Saints*, 592
Suso, Blessed Henry, *Exemplar*, 291
  Little Book of Eternal Wisdom, 291
Swabia, 299
Sweden, 509
  Union with Norway and Denmark, 508
  Western schism, 120
Sweeting, William, executed, 394
Switzerland, 577
  St. Charles Borromeo, 585
Syncretism, Dogmatic, 386 f.
Synergists, 575

Talaru, Amédée de, Council of Basle, 172
Tarascon, Gerson preaches at, 128
Tarentaise, Archbishop of, Council of Basle, 163 f.
Tasso, *Jerusalem Delivered*, 626
Tauler, John, *Institutiones divinae*, 291
  Mysticism, 290 f.
Taxation of Church property, 17-19, 45
Tebaldeschi, Francesco (card.), election of Urban VI, 114, 116
Templars, Arabic inscriptions, 73 note
  Arrest of, 58 f.
  Charges against, 57
  Council of Vienne, 65 f.
  Trial of, 55
  Wealth of, 56
Ten Articles (Anglican Church), 412
Teresa, St., 596 ff., 637
  Interior Castle, 644
  Mysticism of, 642 ff.
  Way of Perfection, 643 f.
"Terror, English," 406
Tetzel, John (Dominican), 316, 326, 349
  Antitheses, 329
  Indulgences, 325
Teutonic Order, 370
Thaborites, 166 note
Theatines, 522, 595, 603 ff., 614
Theologia platonica (by Ficino), 285
Theologians, and Luther, 345-349
Theology, Renaissance, 281-287
Theology of the Sacraments (by Henry VIII), 394

Theses of Luther, 328
Thirty-nine Articles (Anglican Church), 432
Thomas à Kempis, 135
  Brethren of the Common Life, 134
  Mysticism of, 288
Thomas Aquinas, St., 13, 281, 592, 629
  And political authority, 84
  Summa, 281, 629
Three Henries, War of the, 494
Tiene, Gaetano di (Cajetan), 603
Titian, and Francis I, 441
Todi, Jacopone da (poet), 31
Toledo, Auto da fé at, 580
Toledo, Francisco (Jesuit), 630
Tomacelli, Pierre (Boniface IX), 123 note
Tommaso de Vio (*See* Cajetan, Tommaso)
Torquemada, Juan de (theologian), 179
Torquemada, Thomas de, Spanish Inquisition, 200
Tor di Specchi, Congregation of, 157
Torini, Santi (Fra Angelico), 265 note
Toulouse (France), 596
  Father Anger at, 624
  Jesuit college, 623
  Seminary founded, 590
  Slaughter of Huguenots, 489
  Study of Roman law, 10
Tournelle, The, 475
Tournon (France), Jesuit college, 623
Tournon, Cardinal de, 454, 456, 483
  And Michel Servet, 471
Tours, Council at, 247
"*Traditio instrumentorum*," 421
Tradition, rule of faith (Council of Trent), 548 f.
Transubstantiation, Council of Florence, 170
Treason laws, in England, 406
Trebonius, John, 308
Trent, Council of, 542-572
  Canon of Scripture, 550
  Catechism, 609
  Charles V, 559
  Convocation of, 543
  Decisions approved, 530
  Dissolved, 556
  Dominicans at, 547
  Eucharist, 557 f.
  Extreme Unction, 559
  Franciscans at, 547
  Holy Orders, 563
  Immaculate Conception, 552
  Interruption, 556, 560
  Jesuits at, 546
  Justification, 552 ff.
  Mass, 563
  Matrimony, 563
  Original sin, 550 f.
  Penance, 559
  Philip II, 562
  Protestants at, 559
  Reconvoked by Paul IV, 561
  Rule of faith, 548 f.
  Sacraments, 555, 557 ff.
  St. Thomas's *Summa* at, 546 note.
  Scholasticism, 572 note
  Transferred to Bologna, 556
  Vulgate, 550
Trialogus (by Wyclif), 130
Tribonius, 333
Trinitarians, 596
Trionfo, Agostino (theologian), 87
Trithemius (humanist), 302
Triumphus crucis (by Savonarola), 287 f.
Triumphus Veneris (by Bebel), 333
Truce of Malestrout, 95
Truttvetter, Jodocus, 309, 311
Tunstall (bishop), 413
Turks, 532
  Capture of Constantinople, 185
  Overcome Hungary, 522
  Siege of Vienna, 378
Tyburn, Executions at, 406, 434

Ulm, Reformation preached at, 369
Ultima aetate Ecclesiae, De, 106
Unam sanctam, Bull, 38
Union, Council of, 167
  Of Arras, 506, 577
  Of Calmar, 508
  Of Utrecht, 507
Unity of the Church (by Pole), 410
Universities:
  Alcala, 547, 613
  Bologna, 135, 182
  Cambridge, 400, 418, 423
  Douai, 634
  Evora, 636
  Erfurt 310, 359
  Heidelberg, 127
  Ingolstadt, 576
  Louvain, 518

  Oxford, 135, 418
  Padua, 284
  Paris, 125 ff., 129, 135, 197, 463 f., 613, 624
  Pont-à-Mousson, 624
  Rheims, 478
  Rome, 124
  Salamanca, 547, 613, 637
  Upsala, 509
  Vienna, 302
  Wittenberg, 322, 347 note
Urban V (pope), 103-106, 113
  Arrival at Rome, 103
  Beatified, 106 note
  Beghards and Beguines, 292
  Bull *In caena Domini*, 533
  Canonization of St. Elzear, 112
  Departure for Avignon, 107
  Goes to France, 104
  Return to Rome, 92
  Tribute from England, 105
Urban VI (pope), 114-123
  Catherine of Siena, St., 131
  Charles of Durazzo, 121
  Cruelty of, 121
  Election of, 114-119
  Expedition against Joanna of Naples, 121
  Letter from St. Catherine of Siena, 131
  Reform measures, 118
Urban VII (pope), 540
Uriel (archbishop), Jewish books, 331
Ursulines, 607, 610
Usurers, in diocese of Autun, 25
Usury, 300, 331
Usus consumptibilium, 81
Usus pauper, 74
Utopia (by More), 392
Utraquists of Bohemia, 235
Utrecht, Province of, 503
  Union of, 507

Vadstena, 98
Valencia, Araoz at, 621
Valla, Lorenzo, 268 note
  And Eugene IV, 164
  De vero bono, 267
  De voluptate, 198, 267
Valladolid, Auto da fé at, 580 f.
Van Duynsen, Godefried (martyr), 506
Vanozza, Catanei, 222
Varna, Turkish victory at, 175
Vasa, Gustavus, 509
Vasquez, Gabriel (Jesuit), 630, 637
Vassy massacre, 483
Vasteras, Recess of, 510
Vatable (Hebraist), 445, 449, 461
Vatican, Stanze, 279
Vaucluse, Petrarch at, 262
Vaudois, Massacre of the, 455-458
Vega, André de, at Council of Trent, 547
  Lope de (poet), 626
Venaissin, Comtat, 51
Venice, Alliance with Hungary, 194
  Boniface VIII, 24
  Julius II, 242
  Lainez at, 620
  League with Alexander VI, 216, 221
  League with Julius II, 248
  Opposed to Crusade, 187
  Power of, 5
Verceil, Antoine de, 207
Vergerio, 511
Vermigli (Peter Martyr), 418, 511
Vero bono, De (by Valla), 267
Veronese, Paul (painter), 627
Verrochio (painter), 276
Vibero, Beatrix de, executed, 581
Vico, Tommaso (*See* Cajetan, Tommaso)
Victory, Feast of Our Lady of, 532
Vienna, College, 534, 622
  Besieged by Turks, 378
  Concordat of, 181
  University of, 302
Vienne, Council of, 64, 72 f., 90, 542
  Beghards and Beguines, 292
  Heresies condemned, 76
  Raymond Lully, 87
  Templars, 65
Vignola (architect), 627
Villanova, Francisco (Jesuit), 621
Vilna (Poland), College, 534
Vimory, Battle of, 494
Vincent Ferrer, St., and Western schism, 120, 127, 132 f.
Vinci, Leonardo da, 276, 279
  And Francis I, 441
Visconti, Galeazzo, 80
  Giovanni Maria, 5; Assassination of, 200
  Philip Maria, attacks States of the Church, 163

Visione Dei, De (by Nicholas of Cusa), 286
Vitruvius, 274
Vittorino da Feltre, 301
Vocavit nos Pius, Bull, 191
Voluptate, De (by Valla), 267
Volta, Gabriel della, 336
Volterra, Sack of, 200
Vulgate, at Council of Trent, 550
  Revision of, 541
  Sixtus V and, 539

Waldo, Peter, and Vaudois, 455
Wales, Templars in, 63
War of the Knights, 351
  Of the Roses, and feudalism, 5
  Of the Three Henries, 494
Wartburg (castle), Luther at, 362-367
Warwick, Count of, 419, 422
"Waterbeggars," 505
Watham, Abbey of, 398
Way of Perfection (by St. Teresa), 643 f.
Webster, Augustine (martyr), 407
Weigel, Valentine, 387
Weimar, Myconius at, 368
Wenceslaus (king of the Romans), Western schism, 126
Wesel, John, 294, 301
  Doctrines, 294
  Mysticism, 292 ff.
Wessel, John, 293 f.
  Mysticism, 292 ff.
Western schism (*See* Schism, Western)
Westphalia, Anabaptists in, 382
Westminster, Queen Mary at, 425
Wettins, 299
William Durandus, 72
William of Nassau, 502 ff.
William of Nogaret (legist), 14
  Anagni outrage, 39 ff.
  Benedict XI, 43, 45
William of Paris (bishop), 59, 61
William the Silent, 502 ff.
Winchester, Diocese of, 419
Windesheim, 134 f.
Wittelsbach, House of, 96, 299
Wittenberg, 320, 370, 376, 509, 511
  Carlstadt at, 367
  Luther at, 367
  Luther's theses, 328
  Papal Bull burned, 353
Wittenberg University, 347 note
  Luther at, 322
Wolmar, Melchior, 461
Wolsey, Thomas (card.), 396, 399
Works, Good, 296
  Luther and doctrine of, 327
Worms, Conference at, 383
  Diet of, 357-362, 372
  Edict of, 361, 363, 520
Wyclif, John, 48
  De dominio contra unum monachum, 106
  De ultima aetate Ecclesiae, 106
  Declaration to Parliament, 105
  Doctrine, 130
  Influence on Hus, 148
  Prospeculum, 130
  Teaching of, 105 f.
  Trialogus, 130
Wyclifites, 129 ff.
Wyttenbach, Thomas, on indulgences, 295

Xavier, St. Francis, 614, 621

Zaccaria, St. Anton Maria, 606
Zahringens, 299
Zarabella (card.), Council of Constance, 143 f.
  De jurisdictione imperiali, 143
  Papal authority, 144
Zealand, Province of, 503
Ziegler, Margaret, 306
Zoroborowski (Jesuit), 618 note
Zurich, Hutten exiled to, 372
Zwickau, Hussites at, 367
Zwingli, Ulrich, Conference of Marburg, 378
  Diet of Augsburg, 379
  Sacramentary dispute, 374 f.

DATE DUE

DATE DUE

NOV 24 1970

JAN 19 1971

MAY 2 1972

MAR 20 1973

Nov. 28, 2007

GHT ONLY
15 A.M.

DOMINICAN COLLEGE LIBRARY
BX945 .M72 v.5
Mourret, Fer/A history of the Catholic c
3 3645 00049578 1

BX945 .M6813 1930
v.5
Mourret, Fernand, 1854-1938.
A history of the Catholic
church

Dominican College Library
San Rafael, California